CONTENTS

	Pages
Notes on Popular Religion in Bihar— By Sarat Chandra Mitra, M.A., B.L.	309—313
Is the Advaita of Sankara Buddhism in Disguise?— By G. V. Budhakar, B.A. (Hons.)	314—326
Date of "Ishtasiddhi"—II— By C. Hayavadana Rao, B.A., B.L.	327—334
Studies in the Indus Scripts— By S. Srikantha Sastri, M.A.	335—342
A New Hymn of Jnāna-Sambandha— By T. G. Aravamuthan, M.A., B.L.	343—360
Studies in Bird-Myths, No. XLVI— By Sarat Chandra Mitra, M.A., B.L.	361—362
Studies in Plant-Myths, No. XXIV— By Sarat Chandra Mitra, M.A., B.L.	363—367
Notes	368—373
Editorial	374—376

CONTENTS

PAGES

The Religion of the Primitive Tribes of Travancore—
BY L. A. KRISHNA IYER, M.A. .. .. 193—201

On the Origin of the Sanskrit Drama—
BY K. KRISHNAMACHARYA, B.A., L.T. .. 202—210

Jain Vestiges in the Pudukotah State—
BY S. R. BALASUBRAHMANYAN, M.A., L.T., & K. VENKATARANGAM RAJU .. .. 211—217

Sri-Gupta—
BY C. S. K. RAO SAHIB .. .. .. 218—223

Studies in the Indus Scripts—
BY S. SRIKANTHA SASTRI, M.A. .. .. 224—230

Fire-Ordeals—
BY SARAT CHANDRA MITRA, M.A., B.L. .. 231—235

Chakkiyar-Kuttu of Kerala—
BY K. RAMAVARMA RAJA, B.A. .. .. 236—244

Two Centuries of Wadeyar Rule in Mysore (1565-1761)—
BY N. SUBBA RAU, M.A. .. .. .. 245—251

Is the Advaita of Sankara Buddhism in Disguise?—
BY G. V. BUDHAKAR, B.A. (HONS.) .. .. 252—265

A New Hymn of Jnana-Sambandha—
BY T. G. ARAVAMUTHAN, M.A., B.L. .. .. 266—275

Date of "Ishtasiddhi"—I—
BY C. HAYAVADANA RAO, B.A., B.L. .. .. 276—283

Studies in Bird-Myths, No. XLV—
BY SARAT CHANDRA MITRA, M.A., B.L. .. 284—287

Studies in Plant-Myths, No. XXIII—
BY SARAT CHANDRA MITRA, M.A., B.L. .. 288—291

Correspondence .. .. 292—294

Reviews .. .. 295—303

Saarda—Abhidhana Vasthu Kosa of Nagavarma—Catalogue of Wall-Paintings from Ancient Shrines in Central Asia and Sistan—Indian History for Matriculation—Bhasa Kavi—Katyayanasmrti or Vyavahara (Law & Procedure)—Rgveda-Samhita—Part II and Rgveda-Samhita—Mandala I.

Editorial .. .. 304—306

CONTENTS

PAGES

The Twenty-third Annual Meeting of the Mythic Society .. .. 87— 99

Advaita and Sannyasa—
BY SWAMI JAGADISWARANANDA .. .. 100—106

Two Centuries of Wadeyar Rule in Mysore (1565-1761)—
BY N. SUBBA RAU, M.A. .. .. .. 107—115

Jainism in Gangavadi—
BY M. V. KRISHNA RAO, M.A., B.T. .. .. 116—127

Two Dravidic Problems—
BY L. V. RAMASWAMI AIYAR, M.A., B.L. .. 128—142

Sri Vidya—
BY K. NARAYANASWAMI IYAR .. .. 143—155

Vijjika—
BY K. RAGHAVACHARYULU, B.A., B.L. .. 156—159

Is the Advaita of Sankara Buddhism in Disguise—
BY G. V. BUDHAKAR, B.A. (HONS.) .. .. 160—176

Studies in Bird-Myths, No. XLIV—
BY SARAT CHANDRA MITRA, M.A., B.L. .. 177—178

Studies in Plant-Myths, No. XXII—
BY SARAT CHANDRA MITRA, M.A., B.L. .. 179—180

Notes .. .. 181—184

Reviews .. .. 185—187
By Indra's Aid—The Unadi-Sutras, Part I—Rgveda-Samhita, Part I.

Editorial .. .. 188—190

The Mythic Society

COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1933-34

PATRON

HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, G.C.S.I., G.B.E.

Vice-Patrons

HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA GAIKWAR OF BARODA, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.

HIS HIGHNESS THE YUVARAJA OF MYSORE, G.C.I.E.

MAHARAJADHIRAJA SIR BIJAY CHAND MAHTALE BAHADUR, G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I., I.O.M., OF BURDWAN.

Honorary Presidents

THE HON'BLE COL. SIR HUGH DALY, K.C.S.I., K.C.I.E.

THE HON'BLE MR. H. V. COBB, C.S.I., C.I.E., C.B.E.

THE HON'BLE SIR W. P. BARTON, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.

THE HON'BLE LT. COL. C. T. C. PLOWDEN, C.I.E.

Honorary Vice-Presidents

V. P. MADHAVA RAO, ESQ., C.I.E.

RAJAMANTRADHURINA SIR A. R. BANERJI, Kt., C.S.I., C.I.E.

F. J. RICHARDS, ESQ., M.A., M.R.A.S.

RAJASEVASAKTA RAO BAHADUR DR. S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR, M.A., Ph.D., M.R.A.S.

DR. R. P. PARANJPYE, M.A. (Cantab.), B.Sc. (Bom.), D.Sc. (Cal.)

SIR C. V. RAMAN, Kt., D.Sc., F.R.S.

RAJATANTRAPRAVINA SIR BRAJENDRANATH SEAL, Kt., M.A., Ph.D., D.Sc.

RAJASABHABHUSHANA DIWAN BAHADUR SIR K. P. PUTTANNA CHETTY, Kt., C.I.E.

PRESIDENT

RAJAKARYAPRASAKTA RAO BAHADUR M. SHAMA RAO, ESQ., M.A.

Vice-Presidents

AMIN-UL-MULK SIR MIRZA M. ISMAIL, Kt., C.I.E., O.B.E.
RAJADHARMAPRAVINA DIWAN BAHADUR
K. S. CHANDRASEKHARA AIYAR, ESQ., B.A., B.L.
RAJAMANTRAPRAVINA DIWAN BAHADUR
P. RAGHAVENDRA RAO, ESQ., B.A., B.L.
RAJASABHABHUSHANA K. R. SRINIVASIENGAR, ESQ., M.A.
RAJASABHABHUSHANA K. CHANDY, ESQ., B.A.
RAJAMANTRAPRAVINA K. MATTHAN, ESQ., B.A.
PRAKTANA VIMARSA VICHAKSHANA RAO BAHADUR R. NARASIMHACHAR, ESQ., M.A., M.R.A.S.
DR. E. P. METCALFE, D.Sc., F.Inst.P.

General Secretary and Treasurer

S. SRIKANTAYA, ESQ., B.A., B.L., M.R.A.S.

Joint Secretary

A. V. RAMANATHAN, ESQ., B.A.

Editors

F. R. SELL, ESQ., M.A.
K. DEVANATHACHARIAR, ESQ., M.A.
S. SRIKANTAYA, ESQ., B.A., B.L., M.R.A.S.

Branch Secretaries

ETHNOLOGY—RAJACHARITAVISARADA RAO SAHIB
C. HAYAVADANA RAO, ESQ., B.A., B.L.
HISTORY—REV. FATHER C. BROWNE, M.A.
FOLKLORE—B. PUTTAIYA, ESQ., B.A.

COMMITTEE

The above *ex-officio* and P. SAMPAT IYENGAR, ESQ., M.A., MAHAMAHOPADHYAYA ARTHASASTRAVISARADA DR. R. SHAMA SASTRY, B.A., Ph.D., N. S. SUBBA RAO, ESQ., M.A. (Cantab.), Bar-at-Law, A. R. WADIA, ESQ., M.A., Bar-at-Law, DR. M. H. KRISHNA, M.A., D.Litt., K. H. RAMAYYA, ESQ., B.A., Bar-at-Law, S. SHAMANNA, ESQ., B.A., and DR. C. B. RAMA RAO, M.D.

Curator

M. VENKTESIA, ESQ., M.R.S.L.

CONTENTS

PAGES

Is the Advaita of Sankara Buddhism in Disguise?—
BY G. V. BUDHAKAR, B.A. (HONS.) .. .. 1—18

Two Dravidic Problems—
BY L. V. RAMASWAMI AIYAR, M.A., B.L. .. 19—33

Sri Vidya—
BY K. NARAYANASWAMI IYAR .. .. 34—47

Jainism in Gangavadi—
BY M. V. KRISHNA RAO, M.A., B.T. .. .. 48—59

Studies in Bird-Myths, No. XLIII—
BY SARAT CHANDRA MITRA, M.A., B.L. .. 60—64

Studies in Plant-Myths, No. XXI—
BY SARAT CHANDRA MITRA, M.A., B.L. .. 65—67

Notes .. .. 68—70

Reviews .. .. 71—83

Outlines of Indian Philosophy—Heaven and Hell—Chitraprabha: A Commentary on Haridiksita's Laghu Sabdaratna—The Philosophy of Islam—Tarka Tandava of Sri Vyasatirtha—Plotinus on the Beautiful and on Intelligible Beauty—The Indo-Sumero-Semitic-Hittite Problems, Part I—Catalogue of the South Indian Hindu Metal Images in the Madras Government Museum—Journal of the Department of Letters, University of Calcutta—Jataka Parijata—The Hindu Pharmacopœia—Bhasana Ekanka Natakagalu (One-Act Plays of Bhasa)—Raja Ravi Varma's Place in Indian Painting—Sri Sankaracharya and his Kamakoti Peetha.

Editorial .. .. 84—85

The
Quarterly Journal
of the
Mythic Society

Vol. XXIV JULY, 1933 No. 1

IS THE ADVAITA OF ŚANKARA BUDDHISM IN DISGUISE?

BY G. V. BUDHAKAR, B.A. (HONS.)

AN old charge against the Advaita of Śankara is that it is simply Buddhism in disguise. It is, therefore, the duty of sympathetic and impartial scholars and critics to examine the position attacked and reinstate, if possible, the Vedānta of Śankara in its pristine purity. Even scholars like Dāsagupta and Rādhākrishnan have fallen into the same undesirable groove. The first observes, in his *History of Indian Philosophy*, "I am led to think that Śankara's philosophy is largely a compound of Vijñānavāda and Śūnyavāda Buddhism with the Upaniṣadic notion of the permanence of self superadded." Rādhākrishnan has followed suit with this statement that, "The Advaita Vedānta philosophy has been very much influenced by the Mādhyamika doctrine." The time, therefore, seems almost ripe when a clear note of warning should be sounded to all sincere students of the Vedānta.

In dealing with this subject, six points are to be taken into consideration:—(1) Was there any Upaniṣadic support

for the Vedānta of Śankara ? (2) Was there any tradition or literature in support thereof handed down to Śankara ? (3) What original part did Śankara play as compared with his predecessors ? (4) Did Advaitic dialectic owe its origin to dissenting and heterodox schools ? (5) What are the points of similarity and difference between the Advaita and the two schools of Buddhism, *viz.*, the Vijñānavāda and Śūnyavāda? (6) Have the Buddhists levelled this charge against Śankara or is there any other interested party that is responsible for it ?

Let us take up the first two points. That there was sufficient Upaniṣadic support for the Advaita goes without saying when we examine the passages like नेति नेति, मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्, etc. These cannot be explained otherwise, if one has to face philosophical facts squarely and boldly.* All the Upaniṣadic passages can be broadly divided into two lines of thought: some which favour absolutism and others which support pantheism or ideal theism. The first is called the निर्गुणब्रह्मवाद and the other सगुणब्रह्मवाद. The first presupposes absolute unity, while the other is dualistic in outlook and supports unity in diversity. The first, headed by Yājñavalkya and others, was for the select few who took the highest philosophical standpoint; while the other was thought useful for theistic purposes of the masses as a step to the first. The latter deals with objective and relative reality. In the modern methods of research, it is often forgotten that Indian philosophy is wedded to religion. We take them as disconnected dogmas and try to father uncertainty or contradiction on original authors. We forget the grand and graded synthesis which makes room for every one according to one's ability, beginning from a novice to one who has reached the sublime height in religion. Sometimes, we take any one of these views, shorn off from the context or that which has fascination for us and begin to exalt it at the cost of everything else.

---

* Those who are more interested in this question should read *The Doctrine of Māya*, by P. D. Shastri.

We find the two views in the *Bhagavat Gītā*, the masterpiece in the Purāṇa-Itihāsa literature. The Nirguna Brahma in 12. 3-5, the Māyāvāda in 15. 3, and the Brahma Ātmavāda in 13. 2, 18. 61 are referred to by it. These are unmistakably absolutistic passages and there are many more. But, theism is more outstanding because the passages supporting it outnumber those which favour absolutism. As the *Mahābhārata* and the Purāṇas do not mainly differ from the *Bhagavat Gītā* as far as their philosophical outlook is concerned, it is not necessary to deal with them separately. These works are meant particularly for the masses (स्त्रीशूद्रद्विजबन्धूनाम्). Absolutism as it is not meant for them is not so prominently worked out with clear-cut idealistic or negative phraseology, as is seen in the Upaniṣads like the *Chāndogya* and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*. We come across it in the minor Upaniṣads like the *Maitrāyanīya* and *Śvetāśvatara*. The *Sūtasamhita* and *Śrīmat Bhāgavata* treat it. The former work was the basis for the commentary of Śankara on the *Brahma Sūtras*, according to the tradition prevailing in the South. The following verse refers to it:—

तामष्टादशधा कृत्वा शंकरः सूतसंहिताम् ।
चक्रे शारीरकं भाष्यं सर्वश्रुतिमनोहरम् ॥

Scholars are doubtful about the date of the *Bhāgavata*. But, light comes from an unexpected quarter. The Nāndi Sūtra of the Jains refers to the Purāṇas in general as "Purāṇam". So does the *Anuyogadvāra*. The fourth Chheda Sūtra actually refers to the number eighteen of the Purāṇas (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XXI, 1892, p. 297). These three Sūtras are not later than 454 A.D., because Divardhigaṇi, who redacted the Jain canon, knew them. It seems that the wide popularity of the *Bhāgavata* must have made the Nāndi Sūtra refer to it, particularly side by side with the other Purāṇas. Besides, the two verses (1. 6. 25; 1. 8. 52) from it are quoted by Māṭhar in his commentary on the *Sānkhya Kārika* (verses, 51, 2 respectively; Chowkhambhā Sanskrit Series No. 296). This Māṭhar is alluded to by the Nāndi Sūtra. Relying on these two evidences, one cannot accept the argument that many of the

Purāṇas are later than Śankara because he rarely quotes from them. Śankara was mainly concerned with the Śruti. To the Purāṇa-Itihāsa literature he gave secondary importance. On account of this reason, he does not refer to them so often as Rāmānuja and others do. Again, the assertion that the *Bhāgavata* is not quoted by anybody prior to 1100 A.D. does not hold good, because Abhinavagupta (1000 A.D.) mentions it in his *Bhagavat Gītā* commentary (14. 8, Nir. Sāg. Edn. with eight commentaries). Its first Hindi translation by Bhuali appeared in 943 A.D. The *Mahābhārata* in 18. 6. 97 refers to the eighteen Purāṇas. The *Bhāgavata* comes after it, as it says in the introduction. From its own words, therefore, we can say that it cannot be included in the eighteen major Purāṇas or that it, the present edition, is the redacted copy of the original referred to by the major Purāṇas. But, one fact is certain that it has surpassed all the major or minor Purāṇas, as far as its excellence and grandeur are concerned. It seems that the *Bhāgavata* and *Sūta Samhita* were composed in the circles in which philosophical interest was active. It is not, therefore, unnatural if we find many of the negative and idealistic phrases in them.*

The *Vedānta Sūtras*, which wanted to systematise the teaching of the Upaniṣads as understood by almost all the orthodox commentators, could not ignore this two-fold necessity. First, they took their stand on the Brahma Pariṇāmavāda and answered all the other adversaries who followed the different types of Pariṇāmavādas and other theories. Then, they pushed the inquiry a little further and maintained absolutism as the highest truth.

In the *Dharma Sūtras* and *Smṛtis* like those of Āpastamba and Yājñavalkya, we find such passages as the following which are purely Advaitic :—

---

* As regards the *Bhāgavata*, this point is fully treated by D. K. Shastri (*Purātattva*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1983 V.S.), and Y. V. Kolhalkar in his *Bhāgavatādarsha* in Marāthi (pp. 456-460). Mm. Abhyankar Shastri has given all the passages from the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* to support the Advaita in his *Advaitāmoda* (pp. 152-62 and 130-34 Āna. Āsh. San. Series).

स इंद्रियैर्जगतोऽस्य ज्ञानादन्योऽनन्यस्य ज्ञेयात् ।

आ. ध. सू. 1. 22. 2. 10.

आकाशमेकं हि यथा घटादिषु पृथक् भवेत् ।
तथात्मैको ह्यनेकश्च जलधारेष्विवांशुमान् ।

या. स्मृ. 3. 134.

Jaina sources also furnish some information to the same effect. The *Sūtrakritānga* (400–300 B.C.) has the following references:—1. 1. 1. 9; 2. 6. 47–48. The first refers to मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम् and the other raises the objection against One Single Soul that it cannot account for the diversity in the world. The passage 1. 1. 3. 8 of the same is purely theistic, because it refers to Brahma or Prajāpati as the creator. Similarly, the *Sthānāngasutta* of the same period in 8. 3. 607 refers to the Ekavādins, who believe in One Supreme Soul as the first cause and the Anekavādins, who believe in One Supreme Principle manifesting itself in several principles. The *Tatvārthasūtra Tīka* by Umāsvati (78 A.D.) repeats the objection raised by the *Sūtrakritānga* in 2. 6. 47–48. This occurs in 5. 29, p. 131 of it (Biblo. Indi. Ser.). Siddhasena Divākar, who flourished long before 550 A.D., mentions the Advaita and has culled out passages from the Upaniṣads in his Dwātrinshat-dwātrinshikā ch. 9, the *Vedavāda-dwātrinshikā* (Bhāvanagar Edn.). Pūjyapāda (550 A.D.) whom K. B. Pāṭhak assigns to the latter part of the fifth century A.D. refers to the Vedāntins in his *Sarvārthasiddhi*. The allusion which is in his commentary on the *Tatvārthasūtra* runs thus:—

तत्त्वमेकत्वं इति वा सर्वैक्यग्रहणप्रसंगः । पुरुष एव इदं सर्वं इत्यादि कैश्चित्कल्प्यते । (त.सू.स.सि. 1. 2. p. 4). रूपादीनां एकं कारणं अमूर्तम् नित्यं इति केचित्कल्पयन्ति (*ibid.*, 1. 32, p. 77, Kolhāpur Edn.). The annotator says that these are the views of the Vedāntins. This Pūjyapāda in his *Jainendra Vyākaraṇa* refers to Shrīdatta, Yashobhadra, Bhūtibali, Prabhachandra, Siddhasena and Samantabhadra, as his predecessors (*Ind. Ant.*, Octo. 1914). Samantabhadra, according to S. C. Vidyābhūshan (*Indian Logic*), flourished in 600 A.D. But, sufficient reasons are not given there for

this date. This Samantabhadra in his *Āptamīmāmsa* refers to the Vedānta thus :—

अद्वैतैकान्तपक्षेऽपि दृष्टो भेदो विरुध्यते ।
कारकाणां क्रियायाश्च नैकं स्वस्मात्प्रजायते ॥ 24 ॥

Vidyānanda, while commenting on this, calls this view the Brahmādvaita. We shall refer to him later on. Another commentator Akalankadeva who preceded Kumārila explains the verse, without alluding to any view. But, in his *Tattvārtharājavārtik*, he refers to the Vedānta as :—

ज्ञानादेव मोक्ष इति चेदनवस्थानादुपदेशाभावः—त.रा.वा. 1. 2. 11.

Haribhadrasūri in his *Shāstravārtāsamuchchaya* (verses 544 45) and *Yōgabindu* (verses 512-22) refers to the Vedānta as the Advaita or Puruṣādvaita. In the commentary on the latter by himself, the criticism runs thus :—

"वेदान्तिकप्रतिपन्ने बद्धमुक्तयोरविशेषात् अनानात्वात् । वान्ध्येयभेदोपवर्णनकल्पं" इत्यनुवर्तते ।

In the former work, he quotes the following verses :—

यथा विशुद्धमाकाशं तिमिरोपप्लुतो जनः ।
संकीर्णमिव मात्राभिश्चित्राभिरभिमन्यते ॥ 544 ॥
तथेदं अमलं ब्रह्म निर्विकारमविद्यया ।
कलुषत्वमिवापन्नं भेदरूपं प्रकाशते ॥ 545 ॥

These two verses are quoted by Vidyānanda in his *Aṣṭasāhasrī* (p. 93, Nir. Sāg. Edn.) and also by Prabhachandra in his *Prameyakāmalamārtānda* (p. 12, first half, Nir. Sāg. Edn). Kamalaśīla, while criticizing the *Śabdādvaita* of Bhartṛhari in his Panjika on *Tattvasangraha* (Gaek. Orie. Seri., Vol. I, p. 72), quotes them. The author of *Vyāsatātparyanirṇaya* ascribes them to Bhartṛhari, the author of *Vākyapadiya* (p. 32, Vāṇi Vilās Edn.). Sureśvara in his *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika* (Āna. Āsh. Series, Vol. III, p. 1246, 3. 5) quotes them.

All these are the Jain references, which mention the Vedānta from 400 B.C.—800 A.D. The *Sūtrakritānga* gives both absolutism and theism. But all the later authorities generally refer to the first only, as will be seen from the criticism which they advance against it. No theistic or Pāncarātric view is given.

Buddhism also supplies us with similar references. In the *Suttapitaka* of the Hīnayāna, the Ātmavāda is condemned as one of the heresies. It cannot be said that the Vedānta was not the victim of these polemics. The authorities have not taken special care to name the followers of the particular view as remarked by Rhys Davids (*American Lectures*, 1896, pp. 31-37). Turning to the Mahāyāna, we come to three books, *viz.*, the *Lankāvatārasūtra, Buddhacharita* and *Lalitāvistāra.* The first gives the following references:—

(*a*) तत्र विकारानित्यता नाम यदुत रूपस्यान्यथाभूतदर्शनं न भूतानां सुवर्ण-संस्थानभूषणविकारदर्शनवत् । न सुवर्णं भावात् विनश्यति किन्तु भूषणसंस्थानविनाशो भवति । Ch. 3, p. 208.

This is nothing but मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्, *i.e.*, the Māyāvāda.

Again, the Parabrahma and Ātmā are alluded to while rejecting the permanent Entity in the lines:—

निष्ठाभावः **परं ब्रह्म** एतां मात्रां वदाम्यहम् ॥ 26 ॥
प्रज्ञप्तिसत्यतो **ह्यात्मा** द्रव्यसन्नहि विद्यते ॥ 27 ॥
(Ch. 3, p. 153; and Ch. 10, p. 325, vv. 480-81.)

ज्ञानादेव मुक्तिः this view also occurs in Ch. 3, pp. 183-84, v. 68 as ज्ञानेन चान्ये.

(*b*) प्रधान**पुरुषे**श्वरकालानुप्रवादाः ।
(Ch. 2, p. 39.)

अणुप्रधानेश्वर**प्रजापति** प्रभृतयः ।
(Ch. 10, p. 309, v. 345; Ch. 3, p. 197, v. 85.)

प्रधानेश्वर**पुरुष**कालाणुप्रत्ययेभ्यः ।
(Ch. 2, p. 103, v. 165.)

Here, Prajāpati or Puruṣa is certainly theistic, because the Sāṅkhya view is referred to as:—

द्विविधः सांख्यवादश्च प्रधानात्परिणामकम् ।
(Ch. 10, v. 803, Bunyiu Nanjio's Edn.)

The *Buddhacharita* of Aśvaghoṣa gives only the absolutistic Vedānta:—

अध्यात्मकुशलेष्वान्यो निवर्त्यात्मानमात्मना ।
किञ्चिन्नास्तीति संपश्यन्नाकिञ्चन्यः इति स्मृतः ॥ 63 ॥
ततो मुञ्जादिषीकेव शकुनिः कञ्जरादिव ।
क्षेत्रज्ञो निस्सृतो देहान्मुक्त इत्यभिधीयते ॥ 64 ॥

एतत्तत्परमं ब्रह्म निर्लिङ्गं ध्रुवमक्षरम् ।
यन्मोक्ष इति तत्त्वज्ञाः कथयन्ति मनीषिणः ॥ 65 ॥

This is the Brahmātmavāda of the Vedānta. In *Lalitāvistāra* occur both the views:—

(*a*) ते तत्त्वतोऽर्थरहिताः पुरुषं वदन्ति ।
व्यापिं (व्यापिनं) प्रदेशगतं शाश्वतमाहुरेके ॥ 3 ॥ (Absolutistic.)

(*b*) नित्यमनित्यमिति चात्मनि संश्रयद्भिः ।
मोक्षं च देशगमनस्थितमाश्रयद्भिः ॥ 2 ॥ (Theistic.)

(Ch. 21, p. 428, Biblo. Indi. Series, R. L. Mitra's Edn.)

All these three works are roughly assigned to 100 A.D. Āryadeva, the disciple of Nāgārjuna (200 A.D.), refers to the absolutistic Vedānta in his *Chatuśśataka* thus:—

आत्मैव यदि निर्वाणं ज्ञानं पूर्णं भवो भवेत् ।
तदभावे हि संसारे भावनाऽपि न विद्यते ॥ 23 ॥
नरेषु दुःखमुक्तेषु परो नाम न विद्यते ।
सर्वथाऽऽत्मक्षयः तेन श्रेयानित्यभिधीयते ॥ 24 ॥
वरं लौकिकमेवेदं परमार्थो न विद्यते ।
लौकिके विद्यते किञ्चित्परमार्थो न विद्यते ॥ 25 ॥

(नित्यार्थप्रतिषेधे, Ch. 9, vv. 201-25.)

सर्वगः केन चिद्दृष्टो (आत्मा) ॥ 18 ॥

(आत्मशक्त्युपायसंदर्शने,
Ch. 10, v. 243, P. L. Vaidya's Edn., Paris.)

Prior to or coeval with the same period, flourished Shattan, the author of *Maṇimenkalai*. In this work occur the following lines:—

The Brahmavādi told her that the universe is the outcome of one egg brought forth by the Supreme Being Brahma (through Māya).

(Ch. 27, p. 192, Krishnaswami Aiyangar's Edn.)

The translation, as it stands, seems to be faulty. "Through Māya" or some such words should be supplied as we have done; otherwise, the word Parabrahma does not fit in as creation cannot be directly assigned to it according to the Vedāntic view, *viz.*:—

यस्माद्विश्वदादि विश्वमखिलं जातं च मायामयं ।

From Japan, we get some light on this subject.

"Thus both in name and doctrine the *Intelligence School* of the Chinese approaches most closely to the school of the Vedānta (also called Uttaramīmāmsa) for which the chief authority is Bādarāyaṇa. Its first principle is the *unity of the Self and the Brahma.*"*

During the first half of the eighth century A.D. flourished Shāntarakshita, the last great Buddhist thinker, who took a review of all the then philosophical schools in India in his *magnum opus* called *Tattvasangraha.* His direct disciple Kamalaśīla expounded his master's principles by writing a voluminous commentary on it. This joint work throws much light on the then philosophical history. In this work is the following reference:—

(*a*) Theistic:—

अन्य इत्यादिना वेदवादिमतमुपक्षिपति :—

अन्ये त्वीशसधर्माणं पुरुषं लोककारणम् ।
कल्पयन्ति दुराख्यातसिद्धान्तानुगबुद्धयः ॥ 153 ॥
समस्तवस्तुप्रलयेऽपि अलुप्तज्ञानशक्तिमान् ।
ऊर्णनाभ इवांशूनां स हेतुः किल जन्मिनाम् ॥ 154 ॥

(*b*) Absolutistic:—

अपरेऽद्वैतदर्शनावलंबिन श्चौपनिषदिकाः क्षित्यादिपरिणामरूपनित्यैकज्ञानस्वभाव-मात्मानं कल्पयन्ति :—

नित्यज्ञानविवर्तोऽयं क्षितितेजो जलाधिकः ।
आत्मा तदात्मकश्चेति संगिरन्तेऽपरे पुनः ॥ 328 ॥

अपरे. इति औपनिषदिकाः

This is nothing but the Ātmavāda criticized in the Hīnayāna Suttas.

These are the Buddhistic references to the Vedānta from the Mahāyāna school from 100 A.D. to 800 A.D. In the *Lankāvatārasūtra*, the different philosophical schools are thus enumerated:—

सांख्या वैशेषिका नग्ना स्तार्किका ईश्वरोदिताः ।
(Ch. 10, v. 723.)

Again:—

सांख्या वैशेषिका नग्ना विप्राः पाशुपतास्तथा ।
(Ch. 10, v. 627.)

* P. 13, *Hindu Logic as preserved in China and Japan*, by Sadajiro Sugiura.

In these lines, there are the Sāṅkhyas, Vaiśeṣikas, Jainas, or Nagnas and Naiyāyikas (Vipras or Tārkikas) as well as Pāśupatas (Īśvaroditas). But the Vedānta, as a school, is absent though to its view we have already referred. Similarly, in *Lalitāvistāra* (Ch. 12, p. 179), Milindapanha *alias* Bhikshusūtra (about 100 A.D., pp. 3-4, Trenckner's Edn.), the Nāndi Sūtra (p. 4 *supra*), and the Bhagavati Sūtra (400 B.C., Ch. 2. 1), there is no allusion to the Vedānta where it is necessary. Nāgārjuna in his *Mādhyamika Kārika*, *Vigrahavyāvartani* and *Upāyahridaya* is silent on this point. His disciple Āryadeva follows him in his *Śataśāstra* though he gives the view in his *Chatuśśataka*. Vasubandhu in his *Abhidammakośa* and *Vijnāptimātratāsiddhi* does not speak anything. His commentator Sthiramati does not throw any light. Chandrakīrti, the commentator of the *Mādhyamika Kārika*, mentions the following teachers:—

जैमिनिकणादकपिलादितीर्थंकर

(P. 159, ll. 7-8; p. 441, l. 6, Biblo. Budhic. Edn.)

But, Bādarāyaṇa is absent. On account of this want of any allusion to the Vedānta as a school, some scholars jump to the conclusion that it did not exist prior to Śankara. We will deal with this point later on. But it is sufficient here to say that the Vedāntic view can be traced back to the fourth century before Christ both from Buddhistic and Jaina sources. Even Bādarāyaṇa, supporting the view of Śankara, is shown to be referred to by the Japanese source. If the objection is meant for being driven against the Vedāntins, whose view Bādarāyaṇa does not support as the theists suppose, it is futile. The theists are equally in the same boat because, when there is no reference to Bādarāyaṇa, one cannot say that the theistic Vedānta could have existed. Words like Vedānta, Uttaramīmāmsa, Brahma Sūtras, and Bādarāyaṇa nowhere seem to occur. In that case, the theists and other scholars, who have assigned 200 B.C. as the probable date for the *Vedānta Sūtras*, will have to be rejected. Thus, they will be untrue to their own theories.

The scarcity of allusions to the Vedānta, in some of the works to which they refer, is possibly due to three reasons.

It may be that Ātmavāda, another name for the Māyāvāda, attacked in the Hīnayāna suttas was too well known to need any philosophical or sectarian allusion. It was possibly considered to be the highest Upaniṣadic view. The same thing must have been observed in the Mahāyāna which criticized the realists like the Sāṅkhyas, Vaiśeṣikas, and Jainas. Again, it may be that Buddhists had a divided house. Some of the Buddhists were busy in explaining their own tenets only as observed by N. Dutt* and by D. T. Suzuki.† The allusion to the Vedānta and other non-Buddhistic schools can be expected in a work like that of Āryadeva or Shāntarakshita who, besides explaining their own tenets and attacking one another from among themselves, are equally busy with treating and examining non-Buddhistic systems in detail from their own standpoint. Such a reference to the Vedānta has already been shown. Besides in "The explanation of Nirvāṇa by Hīnayāna and heretical schools mentioned in the Lankāvatār Sūtra" of Āryadeva, twenty heretical schools are examined. The *Yogāchārabhūmiśāstra* by Maitreyanātha and *Prakaranāryavāchāśāstra* by Asanga refute thirteen and eighteen heretical schools respectively. They are in Chinese. If these schools are identified, it is likely that a reference to the Vedānta might be expected.‡ But from the insufficient material at our disposal, it is not possible to dogmatise over the absence of any allusion to the Vedānta as a school.

To continue the reference to Vedic sources after Yājñavalkya (p. 6), we come to Śabar who, in his commentary on the Pūrvamīmāmsa (1.1.5) after examining all the other theories, accepts and establishes the Neti-Neti-Vāda, *i.e.*, Māyāvāda as the highest philosophical view, which is nothing but the Vedānta pure and simple:—

अथाऽपि ब्राह्मणं (बृ. आ. उ., 6. 7.) भवति । अत्रायं पुरुषः स्वयंज्योतिर्भवति । केन पुनरुपायेनऽयमन्यस्मै कथ्यते इति । तत्रापि उपाये ब्राह्मणं

---

* *Ind. Hist. Qua.*, Vol. V, p. 814, 1929.

† In his *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism*, p. 94.

‡ *Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna* by Kimura, pp. 21-25.

भवति (बृ. आ. उ., 6. 3.) । स एष नेति नेत्यात्मेति होवाच । असौ " एवं रूपः " इति न शक्यते निदर्शयितुम् ।

(P. 69, Āna. Āsh. San. Series.)

Śankara had in his mind this very reference when he referred to Ācārya Śabarasvāmin in his commentary on the *Brahma Sūtras* 3. 3. 53. Similarly, Padmapāda, his direct disciple, in his commentary on the same work observes thus:— तथा च विधिवृत्तमीमांसाभाष्यकारोऽपि उत्सूत्रमेवात्मसिद्धौ पराक्रान्तवान्. There seems to be some difference of opinion about the date of Śabara. Some take him back to 56 B.C., while others bring him down to 500 A.D. Vātsyāyana (400 A.D.), in his commentary on the *Nyāya Sūtras*, has the following remark.— सर्वं एकं सदविशेषात् (न्या. सू. भा. 4.2.40). On this Vācaspati says, "तत्र प्रथमं ब्रह्माद्वैतं उत्थापयति." By this, he means the Vedānta proper. The Māṭhar Vṛtti on the *Sāṅkhya Kārika* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa speaks about the Vedānta thus:—

इह केचिदाचार्याः वेदवादिन इति मन्यन्ते । —एकोऽयं पुरुषः सर्वशरीरेषूपलभ्यते मणिसूत्रवत् । इह रसनायां यावन्तो मणयस्तेषु सर्वेष्वेकमेव सूत्रं प्रवर्तते । एवं मणिभूतेषु शरीरेषु किमेकः सूत्रभूतः परमात्मा । आहोस्वित् जलचन्द्रवत् । पुरुष इति एक एव बहुषु नदीकूपतडागादिष्विवोपलभ्यते इति." p. 31, का. 17. Again on p. 75, का. 61 he says, "एवं पुरुषो द्रष्टव्यः". In both these extracts, the Brahmātmavāda is criticized. Here as well as on p. 4, this Māṭhar is referred to. The present edition of his Vṛtti is alleged by many* to be full of interpolations. But our position is not in the least affected, because we have adduced many other earlier and later evidences to prove our case. Again, the date of the *Bhāgavata* is based on the Nāndi Sūtra because it refers to it. Skāndasvāmin (600-650 A.D.) in his *Nirukta Teeka* refers to both Absolutistic and Theistic Vedānta thus:—

सा च सत्ता कैश्चित्परमात्मत्वेनाध्यवसिता । " स एष महानात्मा सत्तालक्षणः", 'तत्परं ब्रह्म' इति ब्रह्मवादिभिः ।······भेदाभेदाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयः ।

(P. 27, Absolutistic.)

ब्रह्म ह्येवऋग्यजुःसामलक्षणमपरं जगतः कारणं······ ।

(P. 73, Theistic. Sarup's Edn., Lahore.)

---

* *J.R.A.S.*, July 1931, *Māṭhar and Paramārtha*; *Gaudapādā's Bhāshya and Māṭhar Vritti* (Allaha. Uni. Series, Vol. VII, pt. I, pp. 371-432, 1931).

Bhartṛhari, the author of *Vākyapadiya*, has the following lines in his work :—

यत्र द्रष्टा च दृश्यं च दर्शनं चापि कल्पितम् ।
तस्यैवार्थस्य सत्यत्वं आहुः त्रैय्यन्त (वेद+अन्त) वादिनः ॥

This unidentified quotation is from *Vyāsatātparya Nirṇaya* (p. 30). The date of Bhartṛhari is about 650 A.D. In the *Harṣacharita*, Bāṇabhaṭṭa (prior to 650 A.D.) says :—

संसारासारत्वकथनकुशलाः ब्रह्मवादिनः (Ch. 5, par. 34, p. 101 and) औपनिषदाः (Ch. 8, par. 5, p. 220, Gajendragadakar's Edn.)

This is nothing but the Māyāvāda of the Upaniṣads.

In *Śukranīti*, occurs the following allusion :—

ब्रह्मैकमद्वितीयं स्यान्नाना नेहास्ति किञ्चन ।
मायिकं सर्वमज्ञानाद्भाति वेदान्तिनां मतम् ॥ 49 ॥

(Ch. 4, Sect. 3.)

There seems to be some difference of opinion as regards the date of this work. K. P. Jayaswal assigns it to 800 A.D.; while Pradhān takes it back to 400 A.D., *i.e.*, after Kāmandak (350 A.D.), the author of *Nītisāra* (*Mod. Rev.* 1916, Vol. I, p. 675). It would not, therefore, be wrong if Śukra were taken to be prior to Śankara. Prabhākara and Kumārila (700-788 A.D.) mention the Vedānta thus :—

इत्याह नास्तिक्यनिराकरिष्णुरात्मास्तितां भाष्यकृदत्र युक्त्या ।
दृढत्वमेतद्विषयश्च बोधः प्रयाति वेदान्तनिषेवणेन ॥ 148 ॥

(Kumārila's *Ślokavārtika*, Ātmavāda.)

By this, he means the above passage of Śabara.

यदि परं ब्रह्मविदामेष निश्चयो यदुपलभ्यते तदसत्यम् । नोपलभ्यते तत् तत्त्वमिति, नमस्तेभ्यः विदुषां नोत्तरं वाच्यम् ।

(P. 30, Prabhākara's *Brihati*. A. S. Bengal Library Manuscript.)

It is generally believed that these two authors had some kind of realistic pluralism in view. But they have formulated it for ritualistic and practical purposes as well as to combat the Buddhist Vijñānavādins and Śūnyavādins. As for the highest philosophical standpoint, they point to the Vedānta. This is clear not only from the passage of *Ślokavārtika* just now quoted but also from Prabhākara's view referred to by *Nyāyaratnāvali* (p. 60, Advaitamanjari Series) :—

निष्प्रपंचं ब्रह्मैवात्मा तथापि कर्मप्रसंगे न तथा वाच्यम्। उक्तं हि कृष्णेन भगवता, "न बुद्धिभेदं जनयेत् अज्ञानां कर्मसंगिनामिति," प्रभाकरग्रन्थोक्तेः।

(P. 16, 144 as quoted in "Introduction to Pūrvamīmāmsa".)

As we gathered together all the available Buddhist and Jain references from 400 B.C. to 800 A.D., so have we collected authorities and passages to support our view from the Vedic sources during the same period. It is traditionally believed that Kumārila was the elder contemporary of Śankara, *i.e.* Śankara met Kumārila at the time of the departure of the latter. This is questioned by some scholars, who take Kumārila to the last quarter of 700 A.D. and Śankara to 788 A.D. This was all right before *Tattvasangraha* was not available. There is, therefore, the necessity of revising the old chronology. It is also to be seen how far the traditional contemporaneousness of Kumārila and Śankara is tenable. These questions are not irrelevant to the present subject. We have followed the speculation of modern scholars for what it is worth in all the dates accepted in this essay. Orthodox scholarship is proved to be untrustworthy in this case, while modern scholars agree among themselves to differ even as regards a single point. The question of chronology is, therefore, uncertain. This present attempt will throw some light simply on the relative chronology of Kumārila and Śankara the Vedic leaders, Shāntarakshita and Kamalaśīla, the champions of flickering Buddhism, as well as Vidyānanda and Haribhadra, the upholders of Jainism. For this purpose, we have put the Jain and Buddhist sources between Yājña-valkya and Śabara, so they can be compared.

From Tibetan sources, it is proved that Shāntarakshita flourished from 705 to 762 A.D. His *Tattvasangraha* was composed in 743 A.D. (Introduction, p. xxiii, to *Tattvasangraha.*) The Tibetan translation was made by a Kashmirian scholar Guṇakarśrībhadra, who was a contemporary of King Lalitāditya of Kashmir (693-729 A.D. Vidyābhushan's *Logic*, p. 324). Even allowing for the discrepancy of 25 years in this calculation (Introduction to Stein's English Translation of *Rājatarangiṇi*, p. 66), which some scholars have shown, we

can say that *Tattvasangraha* was ready by 750 A.D. Shāntarakshita quotes one verse in *Tattvasangraha*, pp. 405-406, of Patrakeshari *alias* Vidyānanda from his *Tattvārthaślokavārtika* (p. 205, Nir. Sāg. Edn.). This Vidyānanda refers to the *Bṛhadāraṇyakavārtika* of Sureśvara in his *Aṣṭasāhasrī* (p. 161, Nir. Sāg. Edn.). Shāntarakshita has directed his attacks mainly against Kumārila. K. B. Pāṭhak has proved that Kumārila criticized both Samantabhadra and Akalankadeva, his commentator.* The Jains say that both Samantabhadra and Siddhasenadivākar flourished in 200 and 400 A.D. respectively. But K. B. Pāṭhak has recently proved that Pūjyapāda's reference to Samantabhadra is an interpolation and that Samantabhadra flourished in the first half of the seventh century.† The Jain view is in R. B. Hirālal's *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prākrit Manuscripts in C.P. and Berar* (Introduction pp. x—xiii). But one fact is certain and enough for our purpose that Samantabhadra and Akalanka preceded Kumārila, who is referred to by Sureśvara in his *Taittirīya Upaniṣad Vārtika.* Pāṭhak brings Shāntarakshita down to 800 A.D. so that he can assign all these people to the last quarter of that century.‡ But the date of Shāntarakshita cannot be later than 762 A.D. as stated above and because Haribhadra, who died in 770, refers to Shāntarakshita.§ Besides, his date is strengthened by the Kashmirian and Tibetan sources. Pāṭhak has neither examined these three sources nor has he advanced serious arguments against them. His theory is, therefore, untenable in the present state of affairs. We have also to reject his other theory, which makes Akalanka the contemporary of Śubhatunga *alias* Krishnarāja I in 750 A.D. as supported by Brahmanemidatta.‖ The other tradition, which makes him the contemporary of Dharmakirti

---

* *Ninth International Congress of Orientalists*, London, 1892, Vol. I, pp. 212-213.

† *Ann. of the Bhand. Ori. Inst.*, Vol. XI, pp. 149-164, "The Date of Samantabhadra ".

‡ *Ann. of the Bhand. Ori. Inst.*, Vol. XIII, Part II, pp. 164–65.

§ *Ann. of the Bhand. Ori. Inst.*, Vol. XII, Part I, pp. 71-84.

‖ *Jaina Sāhitya Saṃśodaka*, Vol. I, No. I, p. 19, etc., " The Date of 'Haribhadrasuri'," by Jinavijaya.

fits in well with the above calculation. His date of Śankara (788 A.D.) is also to be pushed back to 688 A.D. according to the authorities quoted just now. Similarly, we have to reject the theories, which give earlier dates to Śankara; because in his *Upadeśasāhasri* 18. 142 Śankara refers to Dharmakīrti 650 A.D. and Sureśvara actually quotes verses from his work.* *Upadeśasāhasri* is a genuine work of Śankara; because Sureśvara, his direct disciple, quotes verses from it and ascribes it to Śankara in his *Naishkarmyasiddhi*. Dharmakīrti is said to be the contemporary of Kumārila. In this way, the traditional view which makes Śankara to be the contemporary of Kumārila is strengthened. Thus, all these Vaidika, Jaina, and Buddhist authors lived in the last quarter of the seventh century or the first half of the eighth one. The whole result can be thus shown in the form of a table.

Dharmakīrti and Akalanka
|
Kumārila, Śankara, Sureśvara.
|
Vidyānanda
|
Shāntarakshita and Kamalaśīla
|
Haribhadrasūri

As the date of Śankara was oscillating between the two extremes, *viz.*, 688 A.D. and 788 A.D. we had to give the Jaina and Buddhist authors with their works. Now as his date is fixed (688 A.D.—720 A.D.), some of these authors come after him. They, therefore, lose their pre-Śankara historical importance in tracing the history of the Vedānta.

We have been quoting references from various sources to support the Advaitic tradition right up to Śankara. Now it remains to see which independent works there were, *i.e.*, the Advaitic literature prior to Śankara. He refers to many authorities in his works as, "संप्रदायविद्, आचार्य and आगमविद्" and even quotes passages from their works. He accepts the necessity of imparting instruction in this subject traditionally

* *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika*, Ānand. Āsh. San. Series 4. 3. 476, p. 1458.

as an important fact to understand it properly. The passages run thus:—

(1) यैरिमे गुरुभिः पूर्वं पदवाक्य प्रमाणतः ।
व्याख्याताः सर्ववेदान्तास्तान्नित्यं प्रणतोऽस्म्यहम् ॥
(तै. उ. भा., भूमिका.)

(2) सर्वशास्त्रविदपि असंप्रदायविन्मूर्खवदुपेक्षणीयः । (गी. भा. 13. 2.)

(3) अनुकम्पनीया आगमार्थविच्छिन्न संप्रदायबुद्धयः । (बृ. उ. भा. 2. 1. 20.)

In the first passage, he means to say that all the Upaniṣads were commented upon by his predecessors from his line of thought. In the next two is the necessity for traditional instruction. According to the gloss of Ānandagiri on the works of Śankara, one Draviḍācārya is often referred to In the Māṇḍūkya commentary of Śankara, he is called "आगमविद्" (मा. उ. भा. 2. 32) where the gloss says, "द्राविडाचार्यसंमतिमाह". In the *Chhāndogya* commentary (Ānand. Āshr. Series, 3. 8. 4, p. 145), he figures as "अत्रोक्तः परिहारः आचार्यैः" where the gloss runs:— विरोधपरिहारं द्रविडाचार्योक्तमुपपादयति. In the introduction to the same work (1. 1. 1, p. 1.), he says "ऋजुविवरणं अल्पग्रन्थं इदमारभ्यते" where the gloss has the following remark:—अयं पाठक्रममाश्रित्य द्राविडं भाष्यं प्रणीतम्. From these two references, it seems that Draviḍācārya wrote his voluminous commentary on the Sūtras of Brahmanandi on the *Chhāndogya*. This is clear from *Sankshepaśārīraka*, verses 220-221:—

सर्वं विकारमथ संव्यवहारमात्रं अद्वैतमेव परिरक्षति वाक्यकारः ।
अन्तर्गुणा भगवती परदेवतेति प्रत्यग्गुणेति भगवानपि भाष्यकारः ॥

Here "वाक्यकारः" is Brahmanandi and, "भाष्यकारः" is Draviḍācārya, who had his commentary on the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* as Śankara notes on 2. 1. 20 of the same as:—अत्र संप्रदायविद् आख्यायिकां सम्प्रचक्षते (Ānand. Āshr. Series, p.297). The gloss remarks: तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यमैक्यपरं तच्छेषः सृष्ट्यादि वाक्यमित्युक्तेऽर्थे द्रविडाचार्य संमतिमाह. That Brahmanandi supports the Vivartavāda or Māyāvāda is clear from the following quotation:—तथा च ब्रह्मनन्दीवर्णिताधिकारिदृष्ट्यपेक्षया षष्ठेऽध्याये (?) विवर्तमेव विदांचकार (*Journal of the Āndhra Hist. Res. Society*, Vol. V, Pt. 3, January 1931, p. 190). We are not able to identify this quotation. The above extracts

are sufficient to convince that the "वाक्यकार ब्रह्मनन्दि" and "भाष्यकार द्रविडाचार्य" were completely absolutists. Śankara refers to some of his predecessors in *Upadeśasāhasrī* 19. 28; 17. 2; to his preceptor in 18. 233 and to Gaudapāda in 18. 2. Not only did Śankara expound the *Gaudapāda Kārikā* but referred to its author with great respect while quoting it twice:—तथा च संप्रदायविदो वदन्ति (मा. का. 3. 15 quoted in ब्रृ. सू. भा. 1. 4. 14). Again, अत्रोक्तं वेदान्तार्थ संप्रदायविद्भिराचार्यैः (मा. का. 1. 16 quoted in ब्रृ. सू. भा. 2.1.9). In his *Upadeśasāhasrī* (17. 71), he refers to it. In the same work (1. 1. 4), Śankara quotes verses from the Sundarpāndya Vārtika on both the Mīmāmsas.* In his commentary on the *Bhagavat Gītā* (13.13) occurs a quotation which is still not identified:—संप्रदायविदां वचनम् :—अध्यारो पापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपंच्यं प्रपंच्यते इति । Viśvarūpa *alias* Sureśvara in his commentary on the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* quotes a verse, which is still not identified:—

तथान्यैरपि :—यथैकस्मिन्घटाकाशे रजोधूमादिभिर्युते ।
न सर्वे संप्रयुज्यन्ते सुखं दुःखं तथात्मनः ॥ 3. 134

This evidence goes to prove that Śankara had a great support and literature which he has followed. He does not take upon himself the responsibility of chalking out a new path. On account of the ravages of time, a few fragments have survived. But they presuppose older authorities for their support and inspiration. From this, we cannot give the credit of innovating or establishing the Advaita system of philosophy either to Gaudapāda or to Śankara. The current can be traced back to many centuries prior to them as shown above. Many of the references, which we have collected, do not state that the Advaita Vedānta is a personal fancy of any teacher. On the other hand, both the Jain and Buddhist authorities are unanimous in not making any personal reference. They refer to it as the ultimate Vedic or Upaniṣadic view. The main outline of the system was already there.

(To be continued.)

---

* "Problems of Identity in the Cultural History of Ancient India," *Jour. of Ori. Res.*, Madras, Vol. I, Pt. I.

TWO DRAVIDIC PROBLEMS

By L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar, M.A., B.L.

(*Continued from Vol. XXIII, No. 4, p.* 503.)

(*h*) A Few Samasas

(i) *Druta* features are associated with compounds formed with a few Telugu words like *prã-ta, lẽ-ta*, etc.

When compounds are formed, the final *-ta* (which is really a noun-suffix) is dropped, as in *prã-jaduvu* (old education), *lẽ-gommu* (tender branch), etc.

The *ara-sunna* in these compounds represents an old nasal which is characteristic of a number of *guṇavacanas* in all Dravidian speeches in the south. I have discussed this nasal elsewhere in this essay, and I may now content myself with pointing out how the Telugu nasal here is a part of its parental heritage in as much as there are cognate compounds in Tamil showing the nasal before plosives.

Telugu *prã-* (old) in compounds structurally corresponds to Tamil *paḻa*[*ṅ*]- (old) in compounds like *paḻaṅ-gaṟi* (old curry), *paḻam-boruḷ* (' old substance,' God), etc.

Telugu *lẽ-* (young) corresponds to Tamil *iḷa*[*n*]- before plosives in compounds like *iḻaṅ-gadir* (tender ray), *iḷaṅ-gâl* (mild wind), etc.

(ii) The *druta* features associated with *kañ-jīkaṭi* (darkness of vision), *pon-dâmara* (gold lotus), *muṅ-goṅgu* (front hem), etc., are due to the final nasal of *kan-n-u, pon-n-u* and *mun-* respectively. As their Tamil and Kannaḍa cognates would illustrate, the first two forms presumably had consonantal nasals in final positions: *Cf. kaṇ, pon* of old Tamil and old Kannaḍa, beside *kaṇṇu* and *ponnu*. Telugu now shows only *kannu* and *ponnu* with gemination of *-n-* and the incorporation of the final *-u*, while an older stage is evidenced by the compounds under reference.

The literary Dialect compared with the popular Speech with particular reference to the *druta n*

[The comparisons indicated below are in no way exhaustive. Salient facts, significant for the illumination of the nature of the *druta n*, alone are given here. We shall see below that the *druta -n* has dropped off in a number of cases, while in others it has either kept itself up or left behind traces of its existence and influence.]

Inflexional Particles

(i) The accusative ending is generally retained with the incorporation of the enunciative *-u* or *-i* (the latter wherever vocalic harmony operates).

(ii) The datival *-kin*, *-kun* of the literary dialect lose their final *druta n* in the popular speech.

We have already noted how in the literary dialect itself a sort of impermanence was attached to the final *n* here (from very early stages, presumably), as reflected in the optional disappearance of *n* before vowels in *druta sandhi*.

(iii) The literary locative particle *-an* appears without the *druta* in the popular speech ; *-a* (without *-n*) is found in instances like the following :

1. *kâgitâna* < *kâgitamu-n-a* (on paper) ;
   mârgamu-n-a[1] (on the road) ;
   î rôju-n-a (' on this day ' > ' to-day ') ;
   dêśamu-n-a (in the land).
2. In post-positions like the following :—
   andu-n-a (on account of)
   valan-a, valla (by)
   côppu-n-a (according to)
   pai-n-a (above)
   cêt-a (by)
   mîd-a (above)
   eduṭ-a (in front of)
   vaipu-n-a (on the side)
   proddu-n-a- (at dawn)

---

[1] The *-n-* appearing before *-a* is part of the inflexional augment.

It may be observed here that the most common locative affix in the popular speech is *lô*, as in *iṇṭlô* < *iṇṭilô* (in the house), *baṇḍlô* < *baṇḍilô* (in the cart), *kaḷḷa-lô* [or *kaḷḷa-ḷḷô*] (in the eyes), *ûḷḷô* [or *ûr-lô*] (in the country, village), *vâḷḷalô* (among them), *strîlalô* (among the women).

POST-POSITIONS

Besides the post-positions mentioned above, the popular speech has *tô*, *tôḍa*, *valla* (< *valna* < *valana* < *valanan*) and a number of others. None of these post-positions ordinarily shows the *druta n* in the popular speech ; but it is remarkable that in most of them when they combine with the emphatic particle *-ê* so as to form " intimate compounds," the old *-n* appears in the new inter-vocalic positions created by the use of this emphatic *-ê* :

tôḍa-n-ê (immediately when, as soon as), as in *mîru ceppina tôḍanê* (as soon as you told me).

tônê (emphatic form of *tô*) as in *attí udârâśayamu tônê* (with such a generous intention), etc.

veṇṭa-n-ê (immediately after or at the moment that), as in *vâḍu koṭṭina veṇṭanê* (directly at the moment when he struck).

lô-n-ê (emphatic form of *lô*) as in *baṇḍ-lônê paḍukunnânu* (I lay down in the carriage itself).

mîda-n-ê (above) as in *dâni vennu mîda-n-ê* (on its back itself).

We shall see below that in other categories also the *druta n* may appear preserved in the popular speech when new inter-vocal positions arise. So far as the post-positions are concerned, we may also note here that when the *samuccaya -unnu* appears after *lô* (whereby an intimate combination of *lô* and *unnu* is rendered inevitable), the *druta n* of the old *lôn* is preserved inter-vocally between the final of *lô* and the initial of *unnu* : *mâ lô-n-unnu mî lô-n-unnu* (amongst us and you).

(iii) The literary personal pronouns *nên* and *tân* are retained with the incorporation of *-u* (as *nênu* and *tânu*) in the popular

speech. The old *ên* (an alternative for *nên*) has been lost in the modern dialects and in the colloquial.

TENSE-ENDINGS

(i) The past tense type with *-t-* (as in *cêsi-t-in, etc.*) is not found in the Northern Circars, though it is not uncommon in the *râyalaśîma* country. Whenever it is used, the first person singular appears with an enunciative *-i* after *-t-in.*[1]

(ii) Some of the chief contexts in the popular speech, in which the old indefinite tense-types are retained, are the following:

(*a*) *vaccunu* (indefinite third person of *vacc-* 'to come') when preceded by the infinitive, expresses the idea of 'permission': *ceppinâ ceppa vaccunu* (it may even be said, *cf.*, for the meaning, Tam. *śonnâlum śollalâm*) ; *brâhmaṇâlu kûragâyalu tina vaccunu* (Brahmins may eat vegetables).

(*b*) *tsâlunu* (is enough), preceded by the infinitive:

abhiprâyamu vastê tsâlunâ? (is it enough if the idea is reproduced ?)

cf. common conversational *tsâlu* (enough) where the *druta n* disappears.

nẽrcunu (materialises), preceded by the infinitive:

â pani tvaragâ ceyya nêrcunâ? (can one do that work soon ?)

(*c*) *telusunu* (is known), as in *â illu mîku telusunâ?* (do you know that house ?); *valênu, valê* (is necessary) are forms used after the infinitive in the colloquial: *pô-valênu, pô-valê* or *pôvâlâ,* (it is necessary to go). The corresponding literary form is *valayunu*, the third person indefinite tense of *valayu.*

(*d*) *uṇḍunu* (the indefinite third person of *uṇḍ-* 'to exist'), when used with participles, expresses the idea of something happening:

---

[1] The final *-n-i* is also often completely dropped in the mass colloquial of the Ceded Districts: *cf. pôti* (I went). Similarly, in some of the other cases adduced below, where the colloquial retains *-n* (followed by *-u*), the masses often reject the final *-nu* altogether.

bailudêrutû uṇḍunu (would be starting), *velḷê uṇḍunu* (would have started).

(*e*) *avunu* (third person indefinite of *ag-* 'to become' is used for 'yes' (*cf.* Tam. *âm*).

(*f*) *erugud-*, the indefinite stem of *erug-* (to know) is used with reference to acquaintance with persons: *âyananu erugudurâ?* (do you know him?); *erugudunu* (I know). In the first person sing. form, the *druta* form is retained with the enunciative *-u*.

(*g*) The same indefinite tense of the type of *koṭṭudun* is employed in complex sentences of the so-called "dignified" varieties of the popular dialect to convey the idea of 'conditional happening' implied in English constructions with 'would', 'would have'—

somm-unnaṭṭayatê, ittunu (if there was money, I would give it) in which *ittunu* is the first person singular indefinite of *icc-* (to give), retained with *druta n* and *-u*.

(*h*) Similarly, in "dignified" compositions of the popular dialect, the other indefinite type (with *-ed-*) is also sometimes used with the meaning 'will'—

eruka-paracedanu (I shall let know).

(*i*) A rare conversational tense formed of the base, the particle *-ê-* and pronominal terminations is supposed to have been derived from the old indefinite tense of the type *koṭṭedan*, etc. This conversational tense implies a certain degree of doubt—*parugetta bôku, paḍêvu* (do not run, thou may'st fall). Here the first and the third person sing. forms retain final *n* followed by *-u*.

Let us note that in all cases where the old *druta* forms are retained in the popular dialect, the enunciative *-u* is incorporated.

Other Verb-endings

(i) The present adverbial participle of the popular dialect does not ordinarily show the old *druta n*, the endings being *-tu* and *-tû*; but the compensatory lengthening of the final vowel in *-tû* is significant in as much as it marks the loss of old *n*.

(ii) The emphatic form of the participle (formed with the particle *-ê*) shows the old *-n* : *snânamu cêstû-n-ê, nâto mâṭlâḍinâḍu* (even whilst taking his bath, he conversed with me). *Cf.* this with the similar preservation of the old *n* in other categories (post-positions and the infinitive).

(iii) The infinitive (*tumannarthaka*) ending *-an* of the literary dialect loses its *n* in the popular speech ordinarily ; it is, however, retained in cases like the following :

1. Intimate compounds formed with *icc-* (to give, allow), like *râ-n-icc-* (to allow to come), *ceyya-n-icc-* (to allow to be done), *mâna-n-icc-* (to allow to be given up), etc. *nannu rânistâra ?* (will you allow me to come ?).

nênu mâninâ amma mâna-n-ivvadu (even though I renounce it, mother will not allow it to be renounced).

2. Two very familiar and expressive conversational compounds : *pô-n-î* and *kâ-n-î*, which convey delicate nuances. The compounds contain the infinitives respectively of *pô-* (to go, pass) and *ag-* (to become), combined with the imperative *ı* of *icc-* (to give, allow). *pônî* (literally *to-go-allow*, 'allow it to go,' 'let that pass') expresses 'consent' or introduces a fresh subject. *kânî* (literally *to-become-allow*, 'allow it to be,' 'let be') might be roughly said to convey the idea of 'Never mind ! all right, let be !'

3. Other intimate phrases where *-n-* is preserved in inter-vocal positions created by the infinitives being followed immediately by words with initial vowels :

Before *akkara-lêdu* : *mîru râ-n-akkara-lêdu* (you to-come -need-not, you need not come).

Before *ârambhinc-* (to begin) (a Sanskrit adaptation) : *ataḍu â pani ceyya-n-ârambhincinâḍu* (he began to do that work), where the *druta n* is preserved in the inter-vocal situation created by the proximity of the final of *ceyya* and the initial of *ârambhinc-*.

A similar *-n-* is kept up in *lêva-n-ett-* (to lift up), constituted of the infinitive *lêva* of *lê-tsu* (to rise) and *ett-* (to lift).

4. The emphatic form of *-gâ*, the infinitive (in popular speech) of *ag-* (to become) appears as *gânê*, when combining

with the emphatic particle *-ê*: *nênu râ-gâ-n-ê atadu pôyâḍu* (as soon as I came, he went away).

5. In cases where an infinitive precedes *êla* (why?): *adi idi ana-n-êla?* (that this to-say-why, 'why say this and that?)

â pani nîvu ceyya-n-êla (why did you do that work?)

Cf. the popular saying: *râya gudda-n-êla, cêya novva-n-êla?* (why beat the stone, and hurt your hand?)

(iii) The literary conditional with *-inan* is not represented in the popular dialect except in one form given below. The literary form with *-inan* does not demarcate the specific ideas of phrases with 'if', 'when', 'after', 'though', etc.; but the popular dialect has different forms to distinguish these ideas; the *druta n* does not crop up ordinarily in any of these colloquial forms:

koṭṭin-aṭṭu (in the manner of striking), *koṭṭin-appuḍu* (when striking), *koṭṭina-tarvâta* (after striking) show the relative participle and *aṭṭu* (such), *appuḍu* (then) and *tarvâta* (after) respectively.

koṭṭa-gâ (on striking) is formed of the infinitive *koṭṭa* and *-gâ*, the infinitive of *ag-* (to become).

koṭṭi-tê (in the event of striking) has the conjunctive participle combined with *tê*, the infinitive of *têcc-* (to bring).

koṭṭinâ (though striking)—this is the structural descendant, in the popular dialect, of the literary conditional with *-inan*. The lengthened final *-â* is compensatory for the loss of old *-n*. This form is used in the popular dialect for (i) conveying the 'concessional' idea, and (ii) expressing the meaning of 'whether-or': *ippuḍu mâninâ, rêp-ênâ ellunḍ-ênâ pôvalenu* (though now given up, it would be necessary to go to-morrow or the day after) where *mâninâ*, and *-êna* (< *ayinâ*) illustrate the meanings.

(iv) The old optatives of the literary dialect are replaced in the popular speech by forms of one type of the indefinite tense, followed by *-gâka*: the *druta n* is sometimes met with here (see the second illustration below):

tvaragâ kôḍalni tîsikoni vattuvu-gâka (mayst thou soon fetch the daughter-in-law!)

mîku kṣêmam kalugunu-gâka (may you be happy!)

The literary *anantaryâdarthaka* or sequential is also absent in the popular speech which in its stead employs phrasal combinations constituted of the relative participle and *avyayas* like *taruvâta*, *pidapa*, etc.

THE SAMUCCAYA

The *samuccaya -un* of the literary dialect is represented in the popular speech by *unnu* after final *-a*, *-â*, *-e* or *-u*, and by *-nni* after final *-i* (of the word), the *-i* arising by vocalic harmony; occasionally words with final *-u* also merely lengthen this *-u* for bringing out the *samuccaya* meaning (*cf.*, Kannaḍa *-û*), as in *ataḍû nênû* (he and I).

The lengthening of *-u* is probably compensatory for the loss of *-n* of old *-un*; while *-unnu* (and *-inni*) of the popular speech is perhaps to be traced to the *samuccaya* variant *unun* occurring in old texts, as in Nannaya's use of *adiyunuṅgâka*, *divambunum-bôle*, etc.

AVYAYAS

In regard to *avyayas*, the popular dialect shows a number of forms with a lengthened final vowel instead of the literary *druta n*:

kûḍâ	literary	*kûḍan*
tsâlâ	,,	*câlan*
dâkâ	,,	*danukan*
mîdâ	,,	*mîdan*
iṅkâ	,,	*îkan*
ninḍâ	,,	*ninḍan*
varakû	,,	*varakun*

Śrîman Mallâdi S. Śâstri points out (*Śabdânuśâsana*, p. 106) that forms like these in which the elision of *druta n* has lengthened final vowels appear in old literary texts and are distinguished by *śiṣṭa vyavahâra*.

Phonetic Changes in the Colloquial

As to the changes involved in the popular dialect in the use of *druta* forms in sentence-constructions, the following points may be noted :

As the rigidity of the *sandhi* rules of the literary dialect is conspicuous by its absence in the popular speech, all the changes characteristic of the former are not present in the latter; yet the following would illustrate how the popular speech does not fail to reflect in its forms some of the old changes.

1. Ordinarily, the popular speech does not evidence the voicing of the surds and of the affricate *c* in the neighbourhood of forms corresponding to the old *druta prakṛtikamulu*. In a few instances of " intimate " phrasal compounds, however, the popular speech does show the voicing of surds; and this voicing has to be ascribed to the influence of the old *druta n* which has disappeared from these forms now :—

(*a*) Passives formed of the infinitive and *paḍ-* : *koṭṭa-baḍ-* (to be struck), *ceppa-baḍ-* (to be spoken), etc. The influence of the old *druta n* of the infinitives may be postulated here for the voicing of *p-* of *paḍ-*.

(*b*) " Intimate " compounds like—

kâ-baṭṭi (therefore)—infinitive *kâ* and *paṭṭi* (from *paṭṭ-* 'to happen', etc.)

lô-baḍ- (to be obedient)—loc. *lô*(*n*) and *paḍ-*

kâ-bôlu (perhaps)—infinitive *kâ*(*n*) and *bôl-* (to resemble)

kâ-bôvu (prospective)—infinitive *kâ*(*n*) and *pôvun*

paḍa-goṭṭ (to thrash so as to fell)—infinitive *paḍa*(*n*) and *koṭṭ-* (to strike)

ceyya-bôku (do not do)—infinitive *ceyya*(*n*) and *pôku* (< *pô-v-aku*)

ceyya-gala (able to do)—infinitive *ceyya*(*n*) and *kalugu*

ceppa-baṭṭi (because of speaking)—infinitive *ceppa*(*n*) and *paṭṭi*

ceyya-boyye pani (work going to be done)—infinitive *ceyya* and *poyye*

2. As already noted under different headings, the old *druta n* is retained before vowels in the popular dialect in inter-vocal contexts cropping up in "intimate" phrases, though otherwise the *druta n* is dropped in the popular dialect (see sections on the post-positions, the infinitive, and the present adverbial participle).

In connection with the *rationale* of the elision in some cases and the preservation in others of *druta n* in the colloquial in the different contexts mentioned in this essay, I would suggest the following perspectives:

(*a*) Final consonantal *n* is impermanent before pauses. Even in the literary dialect, *druta n* is dropped before full pauses. The rigorous *sandhi* rules of literary Telugu do not tolerate too many pauses within a sentence; but in the colloquial, this artificial rigour finds no place, and the pauses caused by breath-groups within a sentence are bound to be numerous. Wherever then the old *druta n* cropped up before these numerous pauses, it should have tended to go to ruin.

Similar cases of the dropping of final consonantal *-n* exist in Kannaḍa and in Tamil:

The first person and the third person singulars of the past and the future tense-forms of mediæval and modern Kannaḍa optionally drop their final *-n*.

In colloquial Tamil the final *-n* of verb-forms like *vandân* (he came), *vandên* (I came) and of pronouns like *nân* (I) or *avan* (he) is either converted to a mere nasalization of the preceding vowel or dropped altogether before pauses.

Cf. also the uniform dropping of final *-n* in forms like *âye* (it became), *vacce* (he came), *aḍige* (he asked) in the Dâsarî dialect of Telugu (*L.S.I.*, IV, p. 601), and the similar elision of *-n* in *pôyâ* (he went), *vinyâ* (he heard), *aḍigyâ* (he asked), etc., in the Vadarî dialect of Telugu (*L.S.I.*, IV, p. 609).

(*b*) Even within breath-groups in a sentence, the old *druta n* had become converted in certain contexts to a half-nasal in the literary dialect at a certain stage in the evolution of Telugu. Half-nasals (of whatever origin) are impermanent

in the extreme, and they have all disappeared completely in colloquial Telugu. This was another reason that contributed to the elision in the colloquial of the *druta* ending.

(*c*) Inter-vocal positions created by intimately attached phrasal compounds prevented, however, the *druta n* from being elided even in the colloquial (see instances given above in the course of this essay).

(*d*) Further, the need for distinctiveness or emphasis of meaning led in some cases to the compensatory lengthening of the vowel standing before the old *druta* sound, even while the impermanent nasal was dropped off (as in certain colloquial *avyayas*, the *samuccaya* and in colloquial forms like *koṭṭinâ* < old literary *koṭṭinan*).

Phonetic Aspects of the changes in the literary dialect

1. The first point deserving of notice in this connection is that the *druta*[1] *n* is consonantal *n*. In every one of the instances we have described above, the literary dialect of Telugu shows the consonantal *n*; and the forms with enunciative vowels, appearing in a few cases in comparatively later stages of the evolution of Telugu, cannot alter the fundamental fact that the consonantal *n* alone can be the pivct cf all the peculiar changes characteristic of this class of words.

The history of the south Dravidian speeches shows that *n* is one of the sounds which can stand without any supporting vowel or enunciative in final positions of words. In Tamil, Malayâḷam and Kannaḍa, the sounds *l*, *n*, *r*, *y*, *ḷ*, *ṇ*, can stand without enunciatives in final positions. *Cf.*, for Kannaḍa, Sûtra 48 of *Śabdamaṇidarpaṇa*; for Tamil, Sûtra 78 of *Tolkâppiyam*, *Eḻuttadigâram*; and for Malayâlam, *Kêraḷapâṇiníyam*, p. 96.

[1] The word *druta* means 'fleeting', 'impermanent'. The term appropriately applies to the peculiar features of disappearance and phonetic modification characteristic of the consonantal *n* in circumstances which we have referred to at the beginning of this essay. The earliest Telugu grammar describes it as *drutâkhyo naḥ*. That the character of this sound was purely consonantal in its original state will have become clear from the comparisons of the *druta* words with their cognates in other Dravidic speeches. It has also been pointed out recently (*Cintâmaṇi viṣaya pariśodhanamu* by Pandit Chinnarâmaswâmi Śâstri) that the Telugu Bhârata shows only the pure consonant as the *druta*.

In Telugu poetry also, *l* and *r* of the plural endings do occur without enunciatives, *e.g.*, *vanamul* (forests), *vâral* (they), *bhûpâlur* (rulers).

When further we remember that the cognates in other south Dravidian speeches of a large number of cases of Telugu *druta prakṛtikamulu* show consonantal *n* only (or consonantal *l* only), it is not unreasonable to think that the *druta n* of Telugu also was originally the pure consonantal sound unaccompanied by any vowel.

2. The Telugu rule that *druta n* combines with the vowel of words following, is in perfect consonance with the principle prevailing in every south Dravidian speech, whereby the pure consonantal sounds in final positions combine with vowels in *sandhi* contexts.

We may note here that the only cases in literary Telugu where the *druta n* may drop off altogether are (as we have seen above) those occurring in poetry before full pauses, before original voiced plosives, before sounds other than plosives, and those in which the sound was in the earliest stages probably inorganic and impermanent (the final *-n* in the Dative *-kin*, *-kun*, in *iṅkan*, in the *śatrarthaka* termination *-cun*, etc.).

3. The change of *druta n* to the *niṇḍu sunna* and to the *ara-sunna* before plosive and affricate consonants is another important phenomenon connected with *druta sandhi*.

The earliest extant Telugu inscriptions show no *ara-sunna* symbol; but on the other hand, even where the metre requires only *ara-sunna*, the *bindu* or the *samśleṣa* is employed. In the Yuddhamalla[1] Inscription, for instance, the *samśleṣa* symbols are employed for denoting *nd* and *ṇḍ*, while for *ṅg*, *ñj*, *mb* the *bindu* is employed. In the Addanki[2] Stone Inscription the script manifests more or less the same features. The *lipi* shows the *bindu* or *samśleṣa* even where the

---

1 *Vide* the pamphlet on "Yuddhamalla Inscription" by J. Ramayya, published by the Ândhra Sâhitya Pariṣad.

2 *Vide* an article (by Somaśekhara Rao) on this inscription in *Bhârati* (March, 1927).

metrical scheme requires the *mâtrâ* of the syllable to be short. Apparently the sound-value of some of these consonant groups had changed from being fully evaluated (as they originally should have been in an earlier stage of the language) to a condition of *ardhânuswâra* or *ara-sunna* for which, however, a separate symbol had (at the time of these early inscriptions) not begun to be used.

This would show that what is described as *ara-sunna* in Telugu was in many cases (including contexts where the *druta n* occurs in the proximity of plosives in sentence constructions) a fully evaluated *varga* nasal originally. This reconstruction of the evolution of the *ara-sunna* in these contexts is in keeping with the description by Ketana in his *Bhâṣânubhûṣaṇa*, of *â(n)di-palikina pûrnânuswâramu* (fully or forcibly uttered full nasal) and *dêlci palikina ardhânuswâramu* (loosely uttered half nasal).

Though the *ardhânuswâra* or *ara-sunna* is not evaluated in modern enunciation, it is probable that at an earlier stage it had a 'nasalizing value' whereby the immediately preceding vowel was nasalized; and this stage itself was preceded by the earlier stage when the sound had a full nasal value corresponding to that of the plosive with which it formed a consonant group.

All these facts are also independently confirmed by the comparative examination, from a general Dravidic standpoint, of Telugu words containing the *ara-sunna*.

Now, in all south Dravidian speeches, the final nasal of a word appearing before the initial plosives (or affricates) of the immediately following words, in combinative positions, becomes assimilated as the *varga* nasal corresponding to the plosive concerned. *Cf.* the evaluation in Tamil of the plural forms *maraṅgaḷ*[1] (trees), *nilaṅgaḷ* (lands), etc., which are

---

[1] The assimilative process has operated further in the corresponding Malayâḷam forms *maraṅṅal*, *nilaṅṅal*; *cf.*, further, the Mal. word *payṅṅa* (green arecanut) with its counterpart in Tamil *pay-ṅ-gây* (green fruit) which is a compound.

constituted of *maram*, *nilam*, etc., and the plural ending *-kaḷ*. For Kannaḍa, *cf.* Sûtra 80 of *Śabdānuśāsana* which states that "*m* and *n* in final positions before plosives optionally become the nasal of the particular *varga*".

For Tamil, *cf.* Sûtra 144 of *Tolkâppiyam*, *Eḻuttadigâram* (Togaimarapu), which states that nasals before *k*, *c*, *t* and *p* generally become *ṅ*, *ñ*, *n* and *m*; the principle is reinforced by other Sûtras in the same section.

Further, the combination of the nasal and the surd plosive generally involves in all the south Dravidian speeches the conversion of the surd to the sonant, the exceptions to this general rule being confined to a few instances in the non-Tamil speeches.

Now, all these features are reflected fundamentally in the Telugu *druta sandhi* contexts with which we are concerned. As we have seen, the proximity of the *druta n* to an initial plosive involves the conversion of *n* to a *varga* nasal on the one hand, and on the other to the voicing of the plosive if the latter is a surd.

The only point of difference to be noted between literary Telugu and other Dravidian speeches is that, whereas in other speeches the combinative positions where the finals of one word would combine with the initial plosives of another, are limited, in literary Telugu the changes were regarded as imperative wherever the *druta n* appeared before the initial plosive of other words in a sentence.

This rule, as we have seen above, is far from being so absolute in the popular dialect of Telugu; indeed, the only change (occurring in connection with contexts involving the old *druta n* and plosives) now preserved in the popular dialect is in a few intimately attached compounds where the nasal has been lost but the original surd appears voiced. Probably the absoluteness with which the rule has been prescribed for the literary dialect in every case of the proximity of *druta n* and plosives, was not justified by the actuality of the conditions of the living speech. A certain

undue standardization may have been introduced into the literary dialect in this respect.

Conclusion

The points discussed in this essay may be summed up thus :—

(*a*) Most of the cases of Telugu literary *druta prakṛtika-mulu* have cognates in other Dravidian speeches ; the chief cases for which such cognates could not be traced are the third person past form with the ending *-en*, the third person indefinite forms with final *-eḍin* and *-eḍun*, the old optative with final *-edun*, and the sequential with *-ḍun*.

(*b*) The *druta n* is in most of the instances a part of the heritage directly handed down to Telugu, while some cases appear to have developed in Telugu in the course of its own independent evolution.

In some instances, the *druta n* stands for a very old *samuccaya* which suffered complete or partial discoloration of meaning in the contexts in which it had been employed.

(*c*) The *druta n* was originally consonantal *n* pure and simple.

(*d*) The changes in connection with *druta sandhi* are in the main explicable on the basis of rules of phonetic phenomena generally occurring in all south Dravidian speeches.

(*e*) Though a high degree of standardization is evident in the absoluteness with which the *druta* rules have been prescribed in the literary dialect, the " popular " or " colloquial " speech does not fail to reflect in many contexts the old *druta n* and the changes connected with it in combinative positions.

ŚRĪ VIDYĀ

Part III—Upasana-Krama

Section (3)—Pancadasi and Sodasi Vidyas

By K. Narayanaswami Iyar

1. Introduction

Sage Durvāsa, in his Devī Mahimnā Stotra, prays to Devī as follows :—

पञ्चाशन्निजदेहजाक्षरभवैर्नानाविधैर्धातुभिः ।
बह्वर्थैः पदवाक्यमानजनकैरर्थादिना भावितैः ॥
साभिप्रायवदर्थकर्मफलदैः ख्यातैरनन्तैरिदं ।
विश्वं व्याप्य चिदात्मनाहमहमिति उज्जृम्भसे मातृके ॥

(*a*) *Mātṛkas*—(i) As the Origin of the Universe.—Devī is known as prakāśa-vimarśa or mūlaprakṛti. अ is prakāśa or mūla and ह is vimarśa or prakṛti. Hence, she is अहं or ahantā. It is said :—

अकारः सर्ववर्णाग्र्यः प्रकाशः परमः शिवः ।
हकारोऽन्त्यः कलारूपो विमर्शाख्यः प्रकीर्तितः ॥

अहं was the first spanda of the Supreme. From it originated the mātṛkas from अ to ह. These letters represent the 36 tattvas. अ and the other vowels denote the first tattva and the other 35 letters from क to क्ष represent the 35 tattvas. The coalition of the 15 vowels from अ to अनुस्वार with the visarga is called Śiva tattva which is unmātra or pure consciousness. The consonants of क च प ट त series arise from the vowels अ इ ओ ऋ ऌ being gutturals, palatals, labials, cerebrals and dentals. The other consonants are only developed forms of these consonants. य and श have developed from च; ल and स from त; व is a combination of त and प; and ह is a development of visarga. The consonants that are thus produced from the vowels and are inseparable from them constitute the Śakti tattva. The 25 tattvas, namely, from pṛthvī to puruṣa, owe their origin to the 25 consonants from

क to म, that is, the 5 mahābhūtas, which are from क to ङ; 5 tanmātras from च to ञ; 5 karmendriyas from ट to ण; 5 jnānendriyas from त to न; five tattvas of manas, ahamkāra, buddhi, prakṛti and puruṣa from प to म.

The extra tattvas originate thus: 4 tattvas of rāga, vidyā, kalā and māyā from य र ल व and mahāmāyā, suddhavidyā, Īśvara, Sadāśiva and Śakti from श ष स ह क्ष. The universe is thus an aggregate of the mātṛkas from अ to ह which, in their turn, may be traced to take their source from अ. While अ is the avyakta (the unmanifested), the vyakta (manifested) universe finds its symbolic representation in the letter क्ष which is a combination of क (the developed form of अ) and स (the developed form of visarga) or Śiva and Śakti or Agni and Soma. अहं which is formed by अ (the origin of mātṛkas) being combined with the penultimate vowel अं and the last consonant ह being put between them. It is an epithet of Aghora the Omniscient One and in the essence of Parā Vāk, All-Transcending Word. Parā Trimśika, with Abhinava Gupta's commentary, gives interesting details on these points.

Śiva Sūtra says :—

अतोऽकार हकाराभ्यां अहमित्यपृथक्तया ।
प्रपञ्चं शिवशक्तिभ्यां क्रोडीकृत्य प्रकाशते ॥

(ii) As Parts of Devī's Body :—

Śrī Pṛthvīdharācārya, in his Siddhasārasvata Stotra, says:—

आद्यो मौळिरथापरो मुख इई नेत्रे च कर्णावुऊ ।
नानावंशपुटौ ऋ ॠ तदनुगौ वर्णौ कपोलद्वयं ॥
दन्ताश्चोर्ध्वमधस्तथोष्ठयुगळं संध्यक्षराणि क्रमात् ।
जिह्वामूलमुदग्रबिन्दुरभितो ग्रीवाविसर्गस्वराः ॥

अ and आ constitute the head and face; इ ई the eyes; उ ऊ the ears; ऋ ॠ the vamśaputau; ऌ ॡ the two cheeks; ए ऐ the upper and lower sets of teeth; ओ औ the upper and lower lips; अनुस्वार the tip of the tongue and विसर्ग the neck.

कादिर्दक्षिणतो भुजस्तदपरो वर्गश्च वामो भुजः ।
टादिस्तादिरथ क्रमेण चरणौ कक्षद्वयं ते पफौ ।
विश्वस्रष्टहृषीकनाभिहृदयं बादित्रयं धातवः ।
याद्यासप्तसमीरणाश्च सहळक्षार्णाभवन्त्यम्बिके ॥

The क series forms her right arm ; च series her left arm ; ट and त series her feet ; प and फ her arm-pits ; ब भ म her hṛṣīka, navel and heart ; seven letters य र ल व श ष स the samīraṇas and ह ळ क्ष the three ārṇās.

(*b*) *Mantra.*—Varivasyā Rahasyā says that the pure vidyā is that whose body is indicated by the vowels, the consonants, three bindus, and three nādās and which is in the form of 36 tattvas as also the one that transcends them. There are four Khaṇḍas in Śrī Vidyā mantra called respectively, Agni, Sūrya, Candra and Kalā. They are also called Vāgbhava, Kāmarāja, Śakti and Turīya Kūtas. Among these four Kūtas, there are three hṛllekhas (hrīm) called granthis (knots) of Brahma, Viṣṇu and Rudra. Jnānārṇava Tantra gives twelve variants of Śrī Vidyā mantra according to the twelve well-known devotees of Devī, *viz.*, Manu, Candra, Kubera, Lopāmudrā, Manmatha, Agastya, Agni, Sūrya, Indra, Skanda, Śiva and Krodha Bhattāraka (Durvāsa). Śrī Vidyā is the mantra *par excellence* which provides the upāsaka with the raft of knowledge that enables him to cross the ocean of māyā and attain mukti from samsāra. It is esoteric and secrecy has always played a prominent part in its instruction as the teacher orally transmits it to the pupil and initiates him into its significance and practices. Samhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa puts this aspect beautifully in the following :

विद्याहवै ब्राह्मणमाजगाम । गोपाय माशेवधीस्तेऽहमस्मि ॥

(i) Mantra defined.—As already pointed out, the doctrine of mantra is based on the principle of the eternity of sound (śabda). The letters of the alphabet, being the ultimate instruments by which sounds are uttered and thoughts are conveyed and explained, are considered to possess supernatural qualities and to contain in themselves an occult

efficacy. Mantra is so called because it saves him that meditates upon it :—

मननात्त्रायते यस्मात् । तस्मात् मन्त्रः प्रकीर्तितः ॥

The mantra contains the name of a divinity in the dative, is preceded by a bīja and ends in certain words. It is, therefore, said :—देवता मन्त्ररूपिणी, *i.e.*, Mantra is identical with the devatā. As regards bījas, Vatulāgama says :—

देवानां बीजनामानि वर्णास्तत्र प्रकल्पिताः ।
तस्माद्वर्णानि चोक्तानि ज्ञात्वा मन्त्रं समुद्धरेत् ॥

The gods are called bījas of the world and letters of the alphabet are called varṇas, as they are derived from the bījas. A thorough knowledge of the letters is, therefore, necessary for composing the mantras.

तत्तद्देवतानामभिधानाक्षरमेव । तत्तद्देवतानामङ्गं भवति ॥

Only such of the letters as bear the names of devatās become the limbs of those devatās.

(ii) Gender of Mantras.—A mantra is masculine, feminine or neuter. Masculine mantras end with the words hum and phat ; feminine ones may end in either hum or phat ; and neuter ones end in namaḥ. Śāradā Tilaka describes them thus :—

पुंस्त्रीनपुंसकात्मनो मन्त्राः सर्वे समीरिताः ।
पुंमन्त्रा हुंफडन्ताः स्यूर्द्विठान्ताश्च स्त्रियो मताः ।
नपुंसका नमोऽन्ताः स्यूरित्युक्ता मनवस्त्रिधा ॥

According to another authority, all feminine mantras should begin with māyā bīja (hrīm) instead of praṇava (om) and end in svāhā in place of namaḥ. While the name of mantras have reference to male deities, the appellation of vidyās applies to female deities according to Śāradā Tilaka :—

मन्त्राः पुंदेवता ज्ञेयाः । विद्या स्त्रीदेवता स्मृता ॥

(iii) Use of Mantras.—Mantras are used either in pūja or in ceremonies performed to achieve particular objects. They are useless if observed without the prescribed rules of krama, samaya, vidhi and kalpa or practised by one who has not received the initiation (dīkṣā).

2. Pancadasi

Regarding this mantra, it is said in Ṣoḍaśīkārṇava :—

अतः प्रधानविद्येयं त्रिपुरा परमेश्वरी ।
नैतस्याः सदृशी काचिद्विद्या देवेशि विद्यते ॥

Tripurasundarī has sixteen kalās as explained in Vāsanā-subhagodaya. The fifteen parts represent the tithis from darśa to pūrṅimā, the sixteenth part being Sat-Cid-Ānanda. While Ṣoḍaśī represents her sixteen kalās, Pancadaśī signifies only fifteen of them. Some Tantras take sixteen as representing the Nitya Devatās, Tripurasundarī being the aṅganitya and the other fifteen Her anga devatās. It is, therefore, said in the Nirukta :—

एकस्यात्मनोऽन्ये देवाः प्रत्यङ्गानि भवन्ति ।

There is only One Supreme; the other gods are but His limbs.

(*a*) *Its Kūtas.*—Pancadaśī has three Kūtas representing Tripurā :—

आद्यं वाग्भवमुच्चार्य कामबीजं द्वितीयकं ।
कुमार्यास्तु त्रितीयन्तु त्रिपुरा परमेश्वरी ॥

The three divisions are called Agni, Sūrya and Candra Khaṇḍas or Vāgbhava, Kāmarāja and Śakti Kūtas and have the bījas of ऐं क्लीं सौः. There are three hṛllekhas among the Kūtas and Devī is called ह्रींकारपञ्जरशुकी.

(i) Kūtas as Parts of Devī's Body.—These divisions may be considered as parts of either the physical (sthūla) or subtle (sūkṣma) śarīra of Devī. She is, therefore, called मूलकूटत्रयकळेबरा. Vāgbhava represents Her lotus face ; Kāmarāja from Her throat to Her waist; and Śakti from Her waist downwards as expressed in Lalitā Sahasranāma :—

श्रीमद्वाग्भवकूटैक स्वरूपमुखपङ्कजा ।
कण्ठादधः कटिपर्यन्तं मध्यमकूटस्वरूपिणी ।
शक्तिकूटैकतापन्नकाद्य अधोभागधारिणी ।

(ii) Kūtas as Śaktis.—Vāmakeśvara Tantra says that Vāgbhava Kūta represents Vāgīśvarī or Jñāna Śakti ; Kāmarāja, Kāmakalā or Kriyā Śakti and Śakti Kūta, Śiva or Icchā

Śakti. Tripurasundarī is the samaṣṭi of the three Śaktis (शक्तित्रयरूपाढ्या).

वागीश्वरी ज्ञानशक्तिर्वाग्भवे मोक्षरूपिणी ।
कामराजे कामकला कामरूपा क्रियात्मिका ॥
शक्तिबीजे पराशक्तिरिच्छैव शिवरूपिणी ।
एवं देवी त्र्यक्षरीतु महात्रिपुरसुन्दरी ॥

3. Sodasi

As the three Kūtas signify the vyaṣṭirūpa (different aspects) of Devī, a fourth (turīya) Kūta is added to the Pancadasī to represent Her samaṣṭirūpa (composite character). It is called Kalā Khaṇḍa and consists of a single bīja श्रीं. Ṣoḍaśī is most ancient, being one of the daśa vidyās. Its upāsana is thus esteemed in Ṛg Veda :—चत्वारईं बिभ्रति क्षेमयन्तः ।

4. Kadi Mata

There are two schools of the Pancadaśī and Ṣoḍaśī Vidyās. Kādi is that which has ka at the beginning and Hādi is that which begins with ha. In Tantrarāja, Śiva tells Devī that Kādi is in Her form and that Śakti confers all siddhis.

(*a*) *Ka as Prajāpati.*—Ka is interpreted as Prajāpati in Taittirīya, Kauśītakī, Tāṇḍya and Śatapatha Brāhmaṇas.

The famous Rik of कस्मैदेवाय is interpreted as below :—

कस्मैदेवाय । कस्मै काय प्रजापतये देवाय । प्रजापतिर्वा कः । तस्मै हविषा विधेम ॥
To which God ? To whom Kāya, the dative of Ka, applies that is Prajāpati. For Ka is Prajāpati. To Him let us offer our oblations. Kāḷī Vilāsa Tantra says :—

ब्रह्मज्योतिः ककारं च विष्णुज्योतिस्तथैव च ।
रुद्रज्योतिः ककारे च ईश्वरस्य तथैव च ।
ककारे श्रीशिवज्योतिः ककारे च परंशिवः ।
सर्ववर्णेषु बोद्धव्यं ककारमुपलक्षणम् ॥

(*b*) *Ka as Kāma.*—Also in the Ṛg Veda, Kāma (Cosmic Will) is described as the first movement that arose in the One through the power of favour or obstruction. Kāma is even worshipped and is said to be unequalled by the gods.

In the Atharva Veda, Kāma is celebrated as a great power superior to all gods. Tripuratāpanī Upaniṣad says :—

निरञ्जनोऽकामत्वेनोज्जृम्भते । अकचटतपयशान् सृजते । तस्मादीश्वरः कामोऽभिधीयते । तत् परिभाषया कामः ककारं व्याप्नोति । काम एवेदं तत्तदिति ककारो गृह्यते ॥

Though He is spotless and has no desire, He creates A to Śa ; therefore the Lord is called Kāma ; and symbolically Kāma is signified by Ka. Surely, Kāma and Tat are meant by Ka.

(c) *Composition of Kādi Vidyā.*—Sage Durvāsa is the reputed head of Kādimata. Sānkhyāyana Śruti explains the Vidyā as below. For sake of secrecy, the letters are given different names which are known to the learned and which are explained in Mātṛka and other Kośas.

कामो योनिः कमला वज्रपाणिर्गुहा हसा मातरिश्वाभ्रमिन्द्रः ।
पुनर्गुहा सकला माया च पुरुव्येषा विश्वमातादि विद्या ॥

(i) *First Kūta.*—It consists of the letters :—

क (कामः)
ए (योनिः)
ई (कमला)
ल (वज्रपाणिः)
ह्रीं (गुहा)

(ii) *Second Kūta.*—It comprises the letters :—

ह } (हस)
स }
क (मातरिश्व)
ह (अभ्रं)
ल (इन्द्रः)
ह्रीं (गुहा)

(iii) *Third Kūta.*—It is made of the letters :—

स }
क } (सकला)
ल }
ह्रीं (माया)

This is the most ancient (पुरुव्येषा) Kādi Vidyā (विश्वमातादि विद्या).

Varivasyā Rahasyā, with Bhāskara Rāya's Bhāṣya, gives the composition as below :—

First or Vāgbhava Kūta.—

क्रोधीशः श्रीकण्ठारूढः कोणत्रयं लक्ष्मीः ।
मांसमनुत्तररूढं वाग्भवकूटं प्रकीर्तितं प्रथमं ॥

It is made of the letters क् (क्रोधीशः)+अ (श्रीकण्ठारूढः) ; ए (कोणत्रयं) ; ई (लक्ष्मीः) and ल् (मांसं)+अ (अनुत्तररूढं).

Second or Kāmarāja Kūta.—

शिवहंसब्रह्मवियच्छक्राः प्रत्येकमक्षरारूढाः ।
द्वैतीयं कूटं कथितं तत् कामराजाख्यम् ॥

It consists of the letters ह् (शिव) ; स् (हंसः) ; क् (ब्रह्म) ; ह् (वियत्) and ल् (शक्रः) with अ added to each letter (प्रत्येकमक्षरारूढाः).

Third or Śakti Kūta.—

शिवतो वियतो मुक्तं तृतीयमिदमेव शक्तिकूटाख्यम् ॥

The third Kūta is got by deducting (मुक्तं) the two letters of ह (शिवतः and वियतः) from the second Kūta, *i.e.*, it consists of सकल.

Hṛllekhas.—To complete the mantra, three hṛllekhas should be added one after each Kūta.

हृल्लेखानां त्रितयं कूट त्रितयेऽपि योज्यमन्ते स्यात् ॥

The composition of the hṛllekha is thus explained :—

हृल्लेखायाः स्वरूपन्तु व्योमाग्निर्वामलोचनं ।
बिन्द्वर्धचन्द्ररोधिन्यो नादनादान्तशक्तयः ॥

It is made of :—

ह (व्योम) ; रेफ (अग्निः) ; ई (वामलोचनं) and अनुस्वार (बिन्दु) as also अर्धचन्द्र, रोधिनी, नाद, नादान्त and शक्ति.

The latter four, *viz.*, rodhinī, nāda, nādānta and śakti, are brought out only in pronunciation and not in writing.

(*d*) *Meaning.*—Agastya Maharṣi, in his Bhāshya on Pancadaśī mantra, gives the following interpretation :—

(i) *First Kūta.*—क (कनदीप्तौ) signifies that it illumines the buddhi; ए (इक्स्मरण) that it helps adyayana (repetition) of knowledge; ई (ईयते=व्याप्नोति) that the buddhi is enabled to pervade or become all-embracing and लह्रीं (लहरीं) that it becomes parokṣa

(esoteric) also. It is the means to dharma the first puruṣārtha and is, therefore, called Vāgbhava. It is of the nature of Ṛg Veda which deals with worship of iṣṭa-devatā and imparts knowledge of ātman. It is the essence of Gāyatrī chandas.

(ii) *Second Kūta.*—ह (हन्यते) means that, by its aid, the tāpatrayas (adhyātmika, adhibhautika and adhidaivika) and the pancabādhās such as enemies and diseases are got rid of; स (सीयन्ते) signifies that, by its help, the upāsakas enjoy (उपभुज्यन्ते) worldly possessions like wealth, conveyance, lands, etc.; ह (हीयते=प्राप्यत) means that, by means of it, one gets all enjoyments (bhogas) and लह्रीं (आधिक्यं) shows that these are got in plenty. By its practice, one gets artha and kāma, the second and third puruṣārthas and is, hence, called Kāmarāja. It is of the nature of Yajur Veda which treats of Karma-mārga. It is the essence of Triṣtup chandas.

(iii) *Third Kūta.*—सकल signifies all tattvas from Śiva to kṣiti and ह्रीं stands for smṛti śakti meaning that all tattvas get absorbed in the One. By its practice, the upāsaka gets mokṣa, the fourth and last puruṣārtha and it is, therefore, called Śakti. It is of the nature of Sāma Veda which deals with nirodha of cittavṛttis (suppression of states of mind) through ānanda (nāda-laya). It is the essence of Jagatī chandas.

(*e*) *Its Identity with Gāyatrī.*—Bhāskara Rāya, in his Bhāṣya on Varivasyā Rahasyā, interprets the Pancadaśī thus:—

सर्वचैतन्यरूपां तां आद्यां विद्यां च धीमहि बुद्धिं या नः प्रचोदयात् ॥

I meditate upon Her the Primeval Cause, Consciousness and the Embodiment of Pancadaśī. May She direct our buddhi. The learned Bhāṣyakāra then identifies the Pancadaśī with Gāyatrī as follows:—

(i) *First Kūta.*—क is तत् (ब्रह्म) ; ए is सवितुः (योनिः) and it is वरेण्यं (श्रेष्ठं); ई stands for भर्गोदेवस्यधी (सर्वान्तर्यामि सर्वाधारःशिवः) ; ल is महि (पृथ्वी the composite of five elements) and ह्रीं (ओं) stands for धीयोयोनः प्रचोदयात् (परतत्वविषयकज्ञानजनक).

(ii) *Second Kūta.*—ह (शिव) is तत् (ब्रह्म) ; स is सवितुः ; क is वरेण्यं ; ह stands for भर्गोदेवस्यधी ; ल is महि and ह्रीं stands for धीयोयोनः प्रचोदयात्.

(iii) *Third Kūta.*—स stands for तत्सवितुर्वरेण्यं ; क for भर्गोदेवस्यधी ; ल for महि and ह्रीं for धीयोयोनः प्रचोदयात्.

(*f*) *The Hṛllekhas and their Significance.*—Śrī Śankarācārya, in his Bhāṣya on Triśatī, says that ह्रीं means Jagat utpatti, sthiti and laya, as ह् (ākāśa bīja) and रेफ (agni bīja) together signify sṛṣṭi ; ई (Manmatha bīja) connotes sthiti and अनुस्वार represents laya. Hrīm also means, according to Śankara, prakṛti of three guṇas, *viz.*, sattva, rajas and tamas, as ह is white, रेफ is red and ई is nīla.

(*g*) *Complete Kādi Vidyā.*—By joining the Kūtas and by adding praṇava (ओं) at the beginning, the mantra is completed and is fit for use. According to Kātyāyana Smṛti, praṇava (ओं) should be used at the beginning and end of the Vedas ; during homas and other propitiatory rites; and in every religious act.

(i) *Pancadaśī.*—ओं । कएईलह्रीं । हसकहलह्रीं । सकलह्रीं ।

(ii) *Ṣoḍaśī.*—It is formed by adding the Turīya Kūta of श्रीं to the Pancadaśī and it is as follows :—

ओं । कएईलह्रीं । हसकहलह्रीं । सकलह्रीं । श्रीं ॥

In the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, it is said that the three letters of क and two of ह are of Śiva Bhāga ; the remaining letters, *viz.*, ए ई ल स are of Śakti Bhāga and ह्रीं partakes of both Śiva and Śakti Bhāgas.

कत्रयं हद्वयं चैव शैवो भागः प्रकीर्तितः ।
शक्त्यक्षराणि शेषाणि ह्रींकार उभयात्मकः ॥

5. Hadi Mata

Lōpāmudra, the consort of Agastya, is the head of Hadi Mata and Tantrarāja is the best authority of that school.

(*a*) *Its Composition.*—Tripuropaniṣad explains its composition thus :—

षष्ठं सप्तममथवह्निसारथिं । चास्यामूलत्रिकमावेशयन्तः ॥
कथ्यं कविं कल्पकं काममीशम् । तुष्टावांसोऽमृतत्वं भजन्ते ॥

Replacing the first three letters of the Kādi Vidyā, *viz.*, क ए ई by the sixth (ह), the seventh (स), and Vahnisārathi (क), the Hādi Vidyā is got. By praising it as God, the Praiseworthy, the Poet, the Creator and the Love, the upāsaka attains immortality.

Śrī Śankarācārya belongs to this mata and the Śrī Vidyā upāsakas of Keraḷa are adherents of this school. Śankarācārya beautifully describes the Hādi Vidyā thus in his Saundarya Laharī :—

शिवः शक्तिः कामः क्षितिरथरविः शीतकिरणः ।
स्मरो हंसः शक्रः तदनुच परामारहरयः ॥
अमूहृल्लेखाभिः तिसृभिरवसानेषु घटिता ।
भजन्ते वर्णास्ते तव जननि नामावयवताम् ॥

(i) First Kūta consists of the letters :—

ह (शिवः)
स (शक्तिः)
क (कामः)
ल (क्षितिः)

(ii) Second Kūta comprises the letters :—

ह (रविः)
स (शीतकिरणः)
क (स्मरः)
ह (हंसः)
ल (शक्रः)

(iii) Third Kūta is made of the letters :—

स (परा)
क (मार)
ल (हरिः=इन्द्रः)

By adding ह्रीं at the end of each of the three kūtas (अमूहृल्लेखाभिस्तिसृभिरवसानेषु घटिता), it becomes the śabdamaya śarīra of the Devī and is worshipped as such.

(*b*) *Complete Hādi Vidyā.*—The complete Vidyā, according to Hādi mata, will be as follows :—

(i) *Pancadaśī.*—

ओं । हसकलह्रीं । हसकहलह्रीं । सकलह्रीं ॥

(ii) *Śoḍaśī.*—

ओं । हसकलह्रीं । हसकहलह्रीं । सकलह्रीं । श्रीं ॥

(c) *Difference in Use between Hādi and Kādi.*—Śrī Śaṅkarācārya, in the following verse in his Saundarya Laharī, shows not only the verbal difference but also the difference in use between Hādi and Kādi Vidyās :—

स्मरं योनिं लक्ष्मीं त्रितयमिदमादौ तव मनोः ।
निधायैके नित्ये निरवधिमहाभोगरसिकाः ॥
भजन्ति त्वां चिन्तामणि गुणनिबद्धाक्षरवलयाः ।
शिवाग्नौ जुह्वन्तः सुरभिघृतधाराहुतिशतैः ॥

6. Japam

(a) *Ācamanam, etc.*—The upāsaka should do ācamanam and prāṇāyāma with praṇava or mūlamantra.

(b) *Ṛṣyādi Nyāsa.*—Śrī Vidyā Tantra gives the following :—

अस्य त्रिपुरसुन्दरी मन्त्रस्य दक्षिणामूर्ति ऋषिः । पङ्क्ती च्छन्दः । श्रीमत्त्रिपुरसुन्दरी देवता । ऐं बीजं । सौः शक्तिः । क्लीं कीलकं । ममाभीष्टसिद्ध्ये विनियोगः ॥

Of this Tripurasundarī mantra, the Ṛṣi is Dakṣiṇāmūrti, metre pankti and devatā Śrīmat Tripurasundarī. Bīja is Aim (Vāgbhava bīja); Śakti is Sauḥ (Śakti bīja) ; and Kīlaka is Klīm (Kāmarāja bīja) ; and the use is the attainment of one's desires.

(c) *Kara Nyāsa* :—

ऐं अंगुष्ठाभ्यां नमः । क्लीं तर्जनीभ्यां नमः । सौः मध्यमाभ्यां नमः । ऐं अनामिकाभ्यां नमः । क्लीं कनिष्ठिकाभ्यां नमः । सौः करतलकरपृष्ठाभ्यां नमः ॥

(d) *Ṣaḍanga Nyāsa* :—

ऐं हृदयाय नमः । क्लीं शिरसे स्वाहा । सौः शिखायै वषट् । ऐं कवचाय हुं । क्लीं नेत्रत्रयाय वौषट् । सौः अस्त्राय फट् ॥

(e) *Digbandha* :—

ओं ऐं क्लीं सौरिति दिग्बन्धः ॥

(f) *Dhyāna.*—The upāsaka then meditates upon the Vidyā, the Vāgbhava in his Mūlādhāra ; Kāmarāja in his Anāhata (heart) and Śakti in his Brahmarandhra. Tantrarāja says :—

आधारे हृदये रन्ध्रे विद्या खण्डत्रयं स्मरेत् ।
लोहितं तत् प्रभावेधाल्लोहितं च निजं वपुः ॥

Jñānārṇava Tantra says :—

अथ त्रिकूटासंपूर्णा महात्रिपुरसुन्दरी ।
चिन्तिता साधकस्याऽऽशु त्रैलोक्यवशकारिणी ॥
क्रमेणनाभिहृद्वक्त्रमण्डलस्थाऽरुणप्रभा ।
पद्मरागमणिस्वच्छा चिन्तनात् सुरवन्दिते ॥
तस्याष्टगुणमैश्वर्यं सौभाग्यं च प्रजायते ॥

Dhyāna of the Kūta.—Jñānārṇava Tantra gives the following dhyānas for the Kūtas :—

Vāgbhava.—

वाग्भवाख्यं जपेद्विद्यां वागीशीं संस्मरन्बुधः ।
कर्पूरधवलां शुभ्रपुष्पाभरणभूषिताम् ॥
अत्यन्तशुभ्रवसनां वज्रमौक्तिकभूषणाम् ।
मुक्ताफलामलमणिजपमालालसत्कराम् ॥
पुस्तकं वरदानं च दधतीमभयप्रदाम् ।
एवं ध्यायेन्महेशानि सर्वविद्याधिपो भवेत् ॥

Kāmarāja.—

मूलादिब्रह्मपर्यन्तं स्फुरद्दीपस्वरूपिणीम् ।
बन्धूककुसुमाकारकान्तिभूषणभूषिताम् ॥
इक्षुकोदण्डपुष्पेषु वरदाभयसत्कराम् ।
तदीयकायसिन्दूरभरितं भुवनत्रयम् ॥

Śakti.—

सृष्टिसंहारपर्यन्तं शरीरे चिन्तयेत् पराम् ।
स्रवत्पीयूषधाराभिः वर्षन्तीं विषहारिणीम् ॥
हेमप्रभाभासमानां विद्युन्निकरसुप्रभाम् ।
स्फुरच्चन्द्रकलापूर्णकलशं वरदाभयौ ॥
ज्ञानमुद्रां च दधतीं साक्षादमृतरूपिणीम् ।
ध्यायन्विषं हरेन्मन्त्री नानाकार व्यवस्थितम् ॥

(*g*) *Japam*—Afterwards, meditation of the mantra is done as many times as the upāsaka can.

7. Conclusion

Of the wonderful powers of this mantra, there are numerous references in the Tantras and Purāṇas. For instance, speaking of the Kāmarāja, one of the three Kūtas, the Brahmāṇḍa and Kāḷikā Purāṇas say :—

एतामेवपुराऽऽराध्य विद्यां त्रैलोक्यमोहिनीं ।
त्रैलोक्यमोहनं रूपं अकार्षीद्भगवान्हरिः ॥
कामदेवोऽपि देवेशि महात्रिपुरसुन्दरीं ।
समाराध्याभवल्लोके सर्वसौभाग्यसुन्दरः ॥

Śrī Śankarācārya praises Kāmarāja aspect of Devī in the self-same strain in his Saundarya Laharī :—

हरिस्त्वामाराध्य प्रणतजनसौभाग्यजननीं ।
पुरा नारी भूत्वा पुररिपुमपि क्षोभमनयत् ॥
स्मरोऽपि त्वां नत्वा रतिनयनलेह्येन वपुषा ।
मुनीनाप्यन्तः प्रभवतिहि मोहायमहताम् ॥

JAINISM IN GANGAVADI

By M. V. Krishna Rao, M.A., B.T.

Introductory

Jainism was once most prevalent in Kannaḍa and Tamil speaking territories of Southern India, where the many remains of mutilated stones, deserted cave buildings and ruined temples recall to our minds the greatness of that religion in the Middle Ages. It is also surmised that the Jaina religion penetrated South India as early as 200 B.C. and that Bhadrabāhu, the last Śrutakevali, who predicted a twelve years' famine in the north, led the great migration across the Vindhyas, accompanied on this journey by his disciple, the Mauryan emperor, Chandragupta. On reaching Śravaṇabeḷgoḷa and perceiving his end to be nearing, the Śrutakevali ordered the Jaina community to proceed on their journey, himself remaining at Vindhyagiri, the smaller hill at that place. There he died, tended in his last moments by his disciple.[1] Upon the death of Bhadrabāhu, Chandragupta continued there as an ascetic for several years, worshipping the footprints of his guru, till his death by the Jaina rite of *Sallekhana*. Megasthenes refers to the devotional teaching of the Śramaṇas, as opposed to the doctrines of the Brahmans and to Chandragupta's disappearance from public life at a comparatively early age. The coincidence of his reign with the accepted date of Bhadrabāhu's death is noteworthy and the reference in *Mudrārākṣasa* to a Jain holding a prominent position in the state goes further to establish that Chandragupta was, in all probability, a contemporary of the Jain guru and a member of his community.

All accounts, while not agreeing whether Bhadrabāhu died in Bharapura in Ujjain or on the Śravaṇabeḷgoḷa hill, nevertheless admit Bhadrabāhu's prediction of the famine and his leading of the Jain migration to the south. He

---

[1] *Ep. Carn.*, III, Sr. 147-148; *E.C.*, II, SB. 31, 67,

was also admittedly the last of the Śrutakevalis and had Chandragupta for his disciple. It must also be remembered that up to this period there was no split in the Jaina fold and indeed this great migration constitutes the initial fact of the Digambara tradition.[2] The Bhadrabāhu legend is further supported by a complete absence of the Śvetāmbaras in the south where the Jains claimed to belong to the Mūla Sangha or the Original Congregation. It may also be observed that the Digambaras have gone from Bhadalpur (Pāṭaliputra) or Tiruppapuliyam (modern Cuddalore) to Delhi and Jaipur for religious propagandism.[3]

For close upon half-a-millennium from this time on, Gaṅgavāḍi witnessed a vigorous and intensive campaign by rival religions competing for supremacy as well as the peregrinations of religious leaders embracing different faiths on missionary enterprise amongst the rulers and the masses. The Jain Āchāryas of the period, of whom the most celebrated were Kuṇḍakunda and Samantabhadra, began proselytising on an extensive scale and secured a rapid spread of their religion and by about the fourth century A.D. Jainism had come to dominate the life and thought of the people of the Pāṇḍya, Chola and Chera kingdoms. Tamil classical literature, itself enriched by Kuṇḍakunda, author of the immortal *Kuṟṟaḷ*, prospered under Jaina auspices. Illangovāḍigaḷ, younger brother of a Chera king and contemporary of Gajabāhu of Ceylon, was a Jain and author of *Silappadikāram*. Jain monasteries and cloisters were abundant. Jain colonies at Kāveripaṭṭanam and Madura grew into importance, and the Jain community was divided into Śrāvakas and Munis.

Gangavadi and the Gangas

Some idea of that tract of country where these convulsing changes were wrought may be given. Gaṅgavāḍi denotes the country originally occupied by the essentially Mysorean dynasty of the Gangas. They were later superseded by their

---

[2] *Vienna Oriental Journal*, VII, p. 382.

[3] *Ind. Ant.*, XXI, pp. 59–60.

kinsmen, the Hoysaḷas. The origin of the Ganga dynasty and the commencement of the reigns of their rulers are rather obscure. Mr. C. Hayavadana Rao gives 250 A.D. with which it is difficult to agree.

Arivarma or Harivarma was probably anointed[4] as ruler by the Pallava king Simhavarman I, who ruled about the middle of the fifth century A.D. Assuming for the moment Arivarman to be the grandson of Mādhava I, the founder of the Ganga dynasty, the origin can neither be the second nor even the third century A.D. Much less can we accept the view[5] that the founder was a scion of the Kaṇva family, who emigrated to the south in search of a throne after the dissolution of the Kaṇva empire in 28 B.C.

The origins of this dynasty must be traced elsewhere and in a manner consistent with traditional accounts and historical facts to an extent. Looking back towards the periods mentioned in legend and tradition as well as by Rice and Mr. Hayavadana Rao and remembering the inferences to be drawn from the inscriptions at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa,[6] it may be observed that a most famous family of kings ruled north of the river Kṛṣṇa in the Āndhradeśa. This Ikṣvāku dynasty was prominent there between 225 A.D. and 340 A.D. The Ganga founders who claim descent from Ikṣvāku Vamśa may really have belonged to this dynasty which not only succeeded to the cultural inheritance of the Śatavāhanas but to a large part of their temporal possessions, thus being enabled to spread Hindu culture to the outside world. The claims of the Chālukyas and the Gangas to have descended from the solar race,[7] the marriage—according to a Nāgārjunakoṇḍa inscription—of an Ikṣvāku princess with the king of Vanavāsi and the pride of the Kaikayas as having brought about matrimonial alliances with Ikṣvākus and Rājarṣis[8],

---

4 *I. A.*, VIII, p. 212.

5 C. Hayavadana Rao, *Mysore Gazetteer*, Vol. II, p. 592.

6 *Mad.E.R.*, 1926, 1927.

7 Rice, *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p. 30; *E.C.*, Vol. VII, Sb. 64.

8 *E.C.* XI, Dg. 161, p. 5.

all indicate that relationship with this family was solicited on account of its high lineage and exalted character. The rule of this dynasty was continued till its displacement by the Śālaṅkāyanas from the one side and the Kadamba Vākāṭaka expansions on the other. Its disappearance and extinction may be dated roughly about 340 A.D. and it coincided with the meteoric descent of Samudragupta into the south, rudely shocking the stability of existing kingdoms and providing opportunities for enterprising men to carve out kingdoms for themselves. Like the Kadamba Mayūraśarman, perhaps the progenitors of the Gangas acted similarly. It is not then improbable that two ambitious Ikṣvāku princes came to Perur in search of a kingdom and with the help of Simhanandi laid the foundations of the Ganga dynasty about the middle of the fourth century. If this view be made probable, it will then be possible to arrange in definite chronological sequence the subsequent reigns of the Ganga rulers.

Royal Patronage

The most powerful supporters of Jainism in the south of India in their day were the Gangas and Jainism was most flourishing under royal patronage in Gaṅgavāḍi. Simhanandi, the great Jaina Āchārya, who assisted in the foundation of the Ganga dynasty about 350 A.D., insisted that, as a *sine qua non* for the people's acceptance of the faith, the princes should lead the way and enter the Jaina fold. Consolidation of the Jainas followed in Gangavāḍi as a matter of course. The preceptor's sage counsel may also be appropriately referred to here: "If you fail in what you promise, if you dissent from the Jina Śāsana, if you take the wives of others, if you are addicted to spirits or flesh, if you associate with the base, if you give not to the needy, if you flee in battle, your race will go to ruin."[9] The Gangas, therefore, always ruled under the protecting and wakeful eye of Jinendra. Intensive propaganda on behalf of Jainism was carried on everywhere. Though the change of faith of Viṣṇugopa into Vaiṣṇavism

---

[9] Rice, *Mysore Gazetteer* (1897), II, p. 310.

perhaps caused the five royal tokens given by Indra to vanish as foretold in the original warning and Todangala Mādhava, Avinīta, Durvinīta and Muṣkara showed distinct predelictions towards Brahmanical Hinduism, nevertheless Jainism on the whole prospered widely in Gaṅgavāḍi under the Gangas. The Gangas from the time of Srīvikrama adhered more steadily to the Jain religion and with the Gangas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas favouring this great faith, it had a remarkably grand career for a few centuries side by side with the Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava forms of Hindu religion. Numerous endowments for temples and temple building sprang up.

Several of the Ganga kings like Nītimārga, Būtuga and Mārasimha were not only well known for their learning and schclarship in Jaina philosophy but remarkable for their great acts of piety. Bastis, monasteries, bridges, mānastambas, renovation of tanks, gifts of villages for religious and humanitarian purposes followed. Chāmunḍarāya, himself the author of a history of the Tīrthankaras, constructed the Chāmundarāya basti and the colossal image of Gomaṭeśvara at Śravaṇabeḷgoḷa. Even Rakkasa Ganga and Nītimārga III during the dark days of the dynasty continued their patronage of this religion. The temple at Talkad was constructed and other works undertaken by them.

Talavanapura or modern Talkad, the capital of the Gangas for about eight centuries, was once a mighty city, adorned with beautiful temples and monuments of architectural interest but it is now, alas, submerged in the sand dunes inexorably hoarded up by the river Kāveri; and who knows that some day, a merciful providence may render munificent aid and thus help towards restoring the architectural beauties and reviving in true and glorious colours the past memories of Ganga rule!

Jain Acharyas and their Work

South India during the ten centuries of the Christian era was an intellectual arena of four warring creeds, Jainism, Buddhism, Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism. That they were

constantly fighting against one another is indelibly preserved by the incidental marks left on the body of the vernacular literature of the country. It may safely be said that Digambara Jainism was supreme in the south maintaining its supremacy unchallenged till practically the ninth century A.D. and that its exalted position was in no small part due to the propagandist activities of the great Jain Āchāryas. In the early centuries of the Christian era there was a rapid spread of the religion and tradition mentions a sage Kuṇḍakunda as having occupied the pontifical chair about 8 B.C. and carried on the work of propagation. All the scattered facts culled out from traditions and literary remains, the identification of Ēlāchārya, the author of *Kuṟṟaḷ*, with Kuṇḍakunda, the priority of *Kuṟṟaḷ* to *Silappadikāram* and *Maṇimegalai*, produce cumulative evidence to conclude Kuṇḍakunda to be of Dravidian origin belonging to the Dravida Sangha.[10] He probably lived in Pātaliputra, the seat of Dravida Sangha and an important town in Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam; and wrote *Panchāstikāya*, *Dvādaśamukhā*, *Pravachanasāra* and *Samayasāra* in Prakrit, then the court language of the Pallavas, for the benefit of the royal disciple Śivakumāra Mahārāja. He is reported to have made triumphant journeys to Pāṇḍya, Chola and Chera kingdoms for the purpose of spreading the Jaina Dharma and converted them to the true faith.

One of the most remarkable teachers in his line, intent on vigorous religious propaganda and on wiping out heretical and nihilistic doctrines of Buddhism, was Samantabhadra, who lived in the neighbourhood of the third century A.D. He is said to have been skilful in reducing to ashes the depressing and obstinate disease *bhasmaka*. An interesting story is told in *Rājāvaḷi Kathe* how he, on the advice of his guru, went to Kānchi to gratify his voracious and morbid appetite and how he miraculously suppressed that appetite and earned the conversion of Śivakoṭi of Kānchi to Jainism.[11]

---

10 *I.A.*, XX, XXI ; *Digambara Pattāvalis*, pp. 60, 61.

11 *E.C.*, II, p. 83.

His disciple later on came to be known as Śivakotâchârya celebrated in Jaina history for writing a commentary on *Tatvārthaśāstra.*[12] It was a custom in those days for a drum to be fixed in a public place in the city.[13] Any learned man visiting to propagate a doctrine or prove his erudition and skill in debate would strike it by way of challenge to disputation. Samantabhadra made full use of this custom and powerfully maintained by his great learning and polemical skill the Jaina doctrine of Syādvāda. This preceptor addressed one unnamed king of Karahaṭaka (Karhad),[14] perhaps the capital of the Silharas and undertook a missionary tour to Pāṭaliputra, Malwa, Sindhu,[15] Tikka, Kānchipura and Vaideśa.

Simhanandi is another celebrated teacher who is mentioned in many inscriptions as helping Mādhava Konganivarma in founding his dynasty and establishing his power.[16] He took up the cause of Mādhava and Diḍiga. He instructed and obtained for them a boon from the Goddess Padmāvati who confirmed it by the gift of a sword and the promise of a kingdom. He made a crown from the petals of the *karṇikāra* blossom and placed it on the heads of the brothers giving them his peacock fan as a banner and in due course provided them with an army and invested them with all kingly powers.[17] He finally insisted on the two brothers changing their faith to Jainism as Gaṅgavāḍi was then predominantly Jain and he attempted with royal support to secure the solidarity of the Jaina community. The immediate successors of Simhanandi were Vakragrīva, Vajranandin, author of *Navastòtra,* and Patrakesari, renowned as a refuter of the *trilakṣaṇā* theory of matter *utpāda, vyaya,* and *dhrauvya,* —existence, extinction and endurance. He is not the Āchārya

12 *Ibid.*, 254.

13 Giles, *Fahien's Travels*, p. 57; Beal, *The Life of Hiuen Tsang*, pp. 161-65.

14 *I.A.*, XXI, 228.

15 *E.C.*, II, Sb. 67; *I.A.*, XXI, 156.

16 *S. I. I.*, II, 387; *E.C.*, VII, Sk. 4; *Ibid.*, VIII, Ng. 35 and 36.

17 Rice, *Mysore Gazetteer*, I, 310.

referred to by Prof. Pathak who imagines him to be identical with Vidyānanda supposed to be a contemporary of Akaḷanka and the refuter of *Asthasasti* and *Pramāṇaparīkṣa.*[18] Sumatideva was the author of *Sumatisaptaka* containing wise thoughts on fortune, wealth, pleasure and salvation. Kumārasena and Chintāmaṇi were the immediate predecessors of the reputed Srīvardhadeva, sometimes called from his birthplace, Tumbulāchārya and the author of *Chūdāmaṇi* containing 96,000 verses, a fact retold in Bhattākaḷanka's *Śabdamaṇidarpaṇa.* An inscription quotes a couplet by Dandin[19] of the seventh century highly praising its author who produced Sarasvatī from the tip of his tongue just as Śiva produced the Ganges from the tip of his top knot.[20]

A contemporary of Srīvardha was Pūjyapāda also called Devanandi who probably belonged to the first half of the seventh century. He was a Jaina muni or anchorite who practised Yoga and was believed to have acquired extraordinary psychic powers. He travelled throughout South India, encountered disputants and successfully vanquished them in open debate. He is reported to have gone as far as Videha (Behar) in the north. His learning extended over a wide range and enabled him to make valuable contributions to Jaina philosophy, logic and grammar. Possibly, Pūjyapāda was the preceptor of Durvinita, as *Śabdāvatāra* (the name of a Nyāsa on Pāṇini) is attributed to a Jain grammarian by name Pūjyapāda belonging probably to the latter half of the sixth century.[21] Pūjyapāda was followed by a few Āchāryas of the type of Maheśvara who probably kept up the traditions of the Mūlasangha by maintaining the supremacy of Jainism over other conflicting religions. The sixth and the seventh centuries witnessed a religious revival in every part of the peninsula. Not only the Gangas, but also the Pallavas of Kānchi and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Malkhed

---

18 *J.B.B.R.A.S.*, XVIII, p. 222 ; *ibid.*, 232.

19 *I.A.*, XLI, 12.

20 *E.C.*, II, Sb. 67.

21 *I.A.*, XIII, 211.

were staunch Jainas, one or two even going to the extent of persecuting other religions. We learn from the inscriptions of Western Chālukya kings Pulakeśin II, Vijayāditya and Vikramāditya II that they favoured the Jaina faith by executing repairs to temples and granting villages to them.[22] When the different kingdoms which were mostly of Jaina persuasion were now threatened by the revival of Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism, serious and energetic efforts were made by Jain Āchāryas to vindicate Jainism by disputations, theological controversies and by solicitation of royal patronage. Favoured and nourished by South Indian kings, Jainism enjoyed a period of prosperity for two centuries along with Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism. According to *Digambara Darśana*, a Dravida Sangha was founded at Madura by Vajranandi, a disciple of Pūjyapāda, for spreading the Jaina faith. Akaḷanka, a Jain teacher from Beḷgoḷa who had been educated in the Buddha College at Ponnāṭanagara (Trivatur), is reported to have vanquished the Buddhists in disputation at Kānchi. He addressed three verses to a king Sāhasatunga Himaśītala and in the third verse claims to have overcome the Baudhhas in his court. He secured the conversion of the prince and the banishment to Ceylon of the Bauddhas who were said to have come from Benares in the third century A.D.[23] Akaḷanka's period also witnessed the reinforcement of Jainism by a further migration of Jains from the north to Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam and the establishment of their settlements at Annāmalai, Madura and Śravaṇabeḷgoḷa. Sandusena, Indusena, Kanakanandi were some of the reputed teachers of the Jaina settlements at Annāmalai. Puṣpasena, Vimalachandra and Indranandi who belonged to the Original Congregation at Śravaṇabeḷgoḷa were probably the colleagues of Akaḷanka and contemporaries of the great Ganga rulers of the eighth century Śrīpuruṣa and Sivavarma II. Vimalachandra, a contemporary of Akaḷanka, challenged the Śaivas, Pāśupatas, Bauddhas, Kāpālikas and Kāpilas in a letter which he applied

---

22 *Bombay Gazetteer*, II, 191.

23 Wilson's *Introductions to Mackenzie's Manuscripts*, p. 40.

to the gate of the palace of an unnamed king with a surname Śatrubhayankara whose city thronged with troops, horses and lofty elephants. Paramādimalla, during his extensive missionary tour, is reported to have quoted a verse in the presence of a king named Kṛṣṇarāya probably of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Āryavāda, another great Jaina missionary, observed the vow of *kāyotsarga* on the small hill at Śravaṇabeḷgoḷa maintaining the limbs in a state of absolute immobility and thus obtained deliverance from the eight terrible kinds of Karma. Chārukīrti and Karmaprakṛti were probably his contemporaries. Srīpāla Deva mentioned in Jina Sena's *Ādipurāṇa*[24] like Āryavāda was a Trividyāchārya, profound in grammar, logic and philosophy. Matisena and Hemasena followed the latter and earned great distinction by challenging Buddhist disputants in the court of one of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings of the period.

The ninth century witnessed a remarkable activity of the Jaina teachers. Inscriptions indicate their swarming in large numbers at Śravaṇabeḷgoḷa and participating in the theological controversies of the time. It was during this century the Tamil country too in spite of the aggressions of Hinduism produced some well-known Jaina teachers as Manḍalapuruṣa, a disciple of Guṇabhadra and author of the Tamil metrical dictionary, and Ajjanandi referred to in *Jīvaka Chintāmaṇi*. Inscriptions found in Melur, Periyakulam, Palni and Madura taluks indicate the extent of the territory over which Jaina influence was felt and the work done by Kurandi Aṣṭopavāsi and his famous disciples Guṇasena, Nāganandi and Ariṣṭanemi.

The Śaivite and Vaiṣṇavite revival under the Nāyanars and Ālwars succeeded in stamping out Jainism in the Tamil country where their downfall was complete by about the ninth and the tenth centuries. After this the Jains in the Tamil country sank into numerical and political obscurity though they retained in full their intellectual vitality and continued to bring out books on grammar, lexicon and astronomy. After their persecution in the Pallava and

[24] *E.C.* II, Sb. 67, 2; *J.B.B.R.A.S.*, XVIII, p. 222.

Pāṇḍya countries by the saints Appar and Sambandar, the Jains probably migrated in large numbers to Gaṅgavāḍi always their centre and settled at Śravaṇabeḷgoḷa.

During this period the Mūlasangha produced some remarkable Jaina Āchāryas who exerted great influence in Gaṅgavāḍi and the Rāṣtrakūta kingdoms. Prabhachandra, one of the most influential Jaina teachers who preceded Jina, the guru of Amoghavarṣa, influenced his sovereign in carrying out works of piety and encouraging Jaina thought and religion. Jina was the author of *Ādipurāṇa* and his royal disciple according to *Chāmuṇḍarāyapurāṇa* wrote *Jinadharmadīpakāṣṭaka*. Guṇabhadra, a disciple of Jinasena, was a contemporary of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa II who ruled between 880-911 A.D.[25] and wrote *Uttarapurāṇa*. Ajitasena reputed to be the author of *Alankārachūdāmaṇi* and *Maṇiprakāśa*[26] was a disciple of Guṇabhadra and the guru of Mārasimha and the celebrated Ganga minister Chamuṇḍarāya. Mārasimha about 973 A.D. retired to Bankapur to end his days by religious exercises at the feet of Ajitasena and died after observing the vow of *Sallekhana*. Chamuṇḍarāya and his son Jinadevana were both lay disciples of Ajitasena and dedicated a temple to him at Śravaṇabeḷgoḷa.

During the time of Ajitasena and his immediate successors great efforts were made with royal support to revive Jainism. Dayapāla who composed the *Hitarūpasiddhi* was the disciple of Matisāgara and fellow-student of Vādirāja. The latter was one of the most remarkable teachers in the latter half of the tenth century who challenged rival religionists in the capital of the Chālukya sovereign Jayasimha II (1018–1042). Śrīvijaya mentioned in Keśirāja's *Śabdamaṇidarpaṇa*[27] and worshipped by Būtuga, Mārasimha and Rakkasa Ganga was a contemporary of Vādirāja.

Arhadbali conspicuous in Jaina history for dividing the

25 *Bombay Gazetteer*, VII, part II, 407-408.

26 *Sanskrit MSS. in Mysore and Coorg*, p. 304.

27 Kittel's edition, p. 4.

Mūlasangha of Sarasvati Gaccha into four sanghas, Sena, Nandi, Deva, Simha, in order to minimise hatred and other evils that might arise owing to the nature of the times,[28] was a disciple of Guṇabhadra as Ajitasena. Early in the eleventh century with the fall of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Ganga dynasties, the activities of Jaina teachers were circumscribed to the limits of Śravaṇabeḷgoḷa and its neighbourhood.

(To be continued.)

---

28 *I.A.*, XXI, 73.

STUDIES IN BIRD-MYTHS
No. XLIII

By Sarat Chandra Mitra, M.A., B.L.

[On a Roumanian Ætiological Myth about the Evolution of the Cuckoo and the Hoopoe.]

There are few birds which are more widely known by good and evil report than the common Cuckoo (*Cuculus canorus*). I am inclined to think that the cuckoo mentioned in the following myth is the common cuckoo. This bird cuckoo is well known for its habit of not remaining in one place, but of always flying from tree to tree, fleeting from branch to branch and uttering its call-note therefrom, so that one cannot ascertain from what place it is calling. The great British poet Wordsworth observed this habit and called this bird "*A Wandering Voice*", as will appear from the two following stanzas of his poem "*To the Cuckoo*":—

"O blithe new-comer! I have heard,
I hear thee and rejoice.
O Cuckoo! shall I call thee bird
Or but a wandering voice?"

"While I am lying on the grass
Thy two-fold shout I hear;
*From hill to hill it seems to pass
At once far off and near.*"

It is for the foregoing reason that, in the undermentioned myth, this bird has been cursed to be "restless, without peace and without quiet".

The female of the common cuckoo does not construct a nest of her own and lay her eggs therein, but always does so in another bird's nest. On this point, the well-known British naturalist Rev. J. G. Wood, M.A., says:—"It is well known that the female cuckoo does not make any nest, but places her egg in the nest of some small bird and leaves it to the care of its unwitting foster-parents. Various birds are

burdened with this charge, such as the hedge-warbler, the pied-wagtail, the meadow-pipit, the red-backed shrike, the blackbird and various finches. Generally, however, the three first are those preferred." *

It is for the foregoing reason that, in the following myth, this bird has been cursed to be without a home, and without a family.

The common Hoopoe (*Upupa epops*) has a very wide range of country for its habitation, being commonly found in Northern Africa, in several parts of Asia and nearly in the whole of Europe including Roumania.

"The general colour of the hoopoe is a combination of white, buff and black, distributed in the following manner:— The plumes of the crest, which is composed of a double row of feathers, are of a reddish buff, each feather being tipped with black. The remainder of the head, neck and breast is purplish buff and the upper part of the beak purple grey. Three semi-circular black bands are drawn across the back and the quill feathers of the wings are marked with broad bands of black and white. The tail is also black with the exception of a sharply defined white semi-circular band that runs across the centre. The under-portions of the body are pale yellowish buff and the under tail-coverts are white. In their colour the two sexes are rather different from each other, the male being of a more ruddy hue than his mate, and having a larger crest. The total length of the adult hoopoe is not quite thirteen inches."†

The common hoopoe is remarkable for its habit of puffing up its body and expanding its crest, whenever it is alarmed. Many people think that this bird does so out of pride. It is for this reason that, in the undermentioned myth, it has been cursed to be always "puffing itself up and crying *whoop, whoop*".

---

* *Vide*, *The Popular Natural History*. By Rev. J. G. Wood, M.A. London, George Routledge & Sons, Limited, 1905. P. 364.

† *Op. cit.*, page 287.

The people of Roumania narrate the undermentioned myth to account for the evolution of the common cuckoo and the common hoopoe:—

The Cuckoo and the Hoopoe

Once upon a time there lived a very poor man and his wife who earned their living with the greatest difficulty. One day the poor man took an axe in his hand and left home to seek his fortune in the wide, wide world. When he had gone far, he came to the edge of a forest and found a beautiful tree with shining leaves and twigs of equal length growing there. Seeing it, the man was about to cut it. Then the tree spoke out: "Don't cut me. I will do you much good." Thereupon the man enquired: "What good will you do me?" The tree replied: "Go in such and such a direction and you will come to a village, of which the residents will appoint you their headman." The man acted up to the tree's instructions and arrived at the village of which the villagers appointed him their headman. After three years, the villagers turned him out; and he again fell into distress. He again went to the tree and was about to cut it. But again the tree asked him not to cut it, for it would do him much good. Then the tree directed him to go to such and such a village of which the residents would appoint him their judge. The man followed the tree's instruction and reached the village of which the people appointed him their judge. After three years, the villagers turned him out, and he again fell into great distress. So he again went to the tree and was about to cut it, whereupon the tree asked him not to do so, for it would do him much good. The tree then directed him to go in a certain direction where he would come to a town of which the citizens would appoint him their emperor. The man did as he was directed to do. After his arrival at the town, the citizens appointed him their emperor. He remained emperor for three years and amassed great wealth. After three years, he was turned out. But his avaricious and proud wife was not satisfied with the great wealth which her husband

had amassed. So she told him to go again to the forest and obtain some more benefit from the tree. The tree seeing him grew angry and said: "O disgraceful and despicable wretch! you are always dissatisfied. I had made thee headman, judge and emperor. But all these benefits did not satisfy thee. Thou art not in need of anything. Now, however, thou hast become impudent and insolent; for thy impious wishes, thou shalt be punished, thou shalt henceforth be a bird, restless, without peace and without quiet, flying from tree to tree and from branch to branch, always dissatisfied, without a home, without a family, and thy name shall be *Cuckoo*. Tell thy wife also, that since she has been urging thee on and compelling thee to do this impious act, she shall become the *hoopoe* who, puffing herself up, shall cry "*whoop! whoop!*" And so they have remained in these bird-forms to this day.*

From a study of the foregoing myth we find that—

(*a*) The Roumanians were careful observers of the habits of birds and noted the restless and the puffing up habit of the cuckoo and hoopoe. But, being unable to explain the origin of these habits, they invented the foregoing myth to account for the same.

(*b*) There is a good deal of folklore about the crest of the hoopoe. On this point Rev. J. G. Wood says: "On account of its very striking and remarkable form it has attracted much notice, and has been the subject of innumerable legends and strange tales nearly all of which relate to its feather crest.

The Turks call the hoopoe *Tirchaous*, or Courier Bird, because its feathery crown bears some resemblance to the plume of feathers which the *chaous* or courier wears as a token of his office. The Swedes are rather fearful of the hoopoe, and dread its presence, which is rare in their country, as a presage of war, considering the plumes as analogous to a helmet. Even in our own country the uneducated rustics

* *Vide*, *Folk Tales of All Nations*, by F. H. Lee. Published by George G. Harrap & Co., London, 1931, Pp. 840-42.

think it an unlucky bird, most probably on account of some old legend which, although forgotten, has not entirely lost its power of exciting prejudice." *

(*c*) The primitive Roumanians believed that there was no difference between human beings and trees and that the latter could talk and act like the former.

(*d*) The foregoing also teaches a great moral lesson, because it inculcates that avarice should be avoided and that avaricious men should be punished.

(*e*) It also teaches that men should not be proud, because "Pride goeth before destruction and haughtiness before a fall."

(*f*) From this myth, we catch a glimpse of the social organization of the primitive Roumanians, for they had towns and villages and emperors, judges and headmen.

* *Vide* Wood's *Popular Natural History*, p. 286.

STUDIES IN PLANT-MYTHS
No. XXI

By Sarat Chandra Mitra, M.A., B.L.

[On a Hungarian Myth about the Speaking Grapes, the Smiling Apples and the Tinkling Apricots.]

Hungary formerly formed part of the Dual monarchy—Austro-Hungary. But, after the Great War of 1914-1918, it has been formed into a separate Republic under the name of Czecho-Slovakia. Its inhabitants are Czechs, Slovaks or Slavs and Magyars, the last race being of Mongoloid origin. These people narrate the following folktale:—

The Speaking Grapes, the Smiling Apples and the Tinkling Apricots.

Once upon a time, there lived a king who had three daughters. On one occasion, the king was going out to travel in a foreign country, and asked his daughters what they would wish him to bring for them from the foreign land. The eldest daughter wanted a golden dress, the second daughter wanted a silver dress and the youngest daughter wanted the speaking grapes, the smiling apples and the tinkling apricots. After his arrival in the foreign country, the king procured the gold and silver dresses; but, notwithstanding the most careful search, could not obtain the speaking grapes, the smiling apples and the tinkling apricots. So, greatly distressed in mind, the king started on his return journey to his own country. In the midst of the journey, the king's carriage stuck fast in the mire and mud and could not be extricated therefrom by the most strenuous efforts. At last, a pig arrived there and spoke with a human voice and said: "O king, if you will marry your youngest daughter to me, I shall extricate your carriage from the mire." Reluctantly and sorrowfully, the king agreed to do so. Thereupon the pig gave a shove and a push to the carriage which at once was moved off from the mud and was driven away to the king's country.

After the king had arrived at his capital, the pig arrived with a wheel-barrow and demanded the princess. The king dressed a beggar girl in a fine dress and gave her to the pig. But the pig at once recognized that she was not the king's youngest daughter and threw her away from the wheel-barrow. Then the king was obliged to bring out his youngest daughter and, dressing her in a ragged and tattered dress, gave her to the pig who at once recognized that she was the real princess, seated her in the wheel-barrow and drove her away to his own litter. The princess wept bitterly all the way and after her arrival at the litter and seeing its squalid surroundings, lamented still more and more bitterly and at last fell asleep. On waking up in the morning, she found that she was in a most beautiful and well-furnished palace and numerous maids and servants were attending to her wants. After some time, she went to the garden attached to the palace and there a grape-vine stretched out his branches and invited the princess to pluck the grapes which could speak; the apple seeing her smiled; and the apricot tinkled out a tune. Then a charming young prince appeared before her and addressing her said: "O princess, I was a prince bewitched by the spells of a magician into the form of a pig. It was ordained that when a princess would come and ask for speaking grapes, the smiling apples and the tinkling apricots, the spells should be removed and I should resume my former human shape and my most squalid surroundings would be changed again into a palace. Now you have come here and asked for the speaking fruits. The spells have been removed; and I am now a prince again." Thereupon they were married and went back to her parents to inform them of their great happiness.*

From a study of the foregoing folktale we find that—

(*a*) The ancient Hungarians believed that there existed among them men who were adepts in magic and sorcery.

(*b*) These magicians, by their spells and incantations, could transform human beings into beasts.

* *Vide, Folk Tales of All Nations* by F. H. Lee. Published by George G. Harrap & Co., London, 1931, Pp. 575—76.

(*c*) These human beings, who had been transformed into beasts, were re-changed into their former human forms on a third party fulfilling a certain condition. This incident occurs in the folklore of other peoples.

(*d*) These magicians were similar to the English fairies who, as in the folktale of *Cinderella*, could, by their spells, change a shabbily-dressed girl into a beautiful princess.

(*e*) The ancient Hungarians further believed that there was no distinction between human beings on the one hand and beasts and plants on the other, and that the latter could speak and act like the former.

NOTES

Panniyur Gramam (=Panni-ur-gramam) in Malabar

THIS Grāmam is a Kerala Brahmin community of Panniyūr, the boar village, which is situated on the southern side of the Bhārata or Ponnani river opposite to Kuttipuram Railway Station. Not far away is another Brahmin village called Chowaram (Sukapuram). Both were in olden days renowned centres of the Kerala Brahminical learning and orthodoxy, rivals to each other in these respects. The former is so called because of the well-known local shrine of 'Varāhamūrti' (the Boar incarnation of Viṣṇu) who was, and still is, the Brahmin (Nambudiri) villagers' patron deity. The original sacred idol of this deity is said to have been burned or destroyed by these villagers themselves long, long ago and this sacrilegious act is still considered to be a memorable event or landmark in the traditional history of Kerala. For, says Prof. K. Rama Pisharoti (in his paper on "The Age of Sankara" contributed to *The Vedanta Kesari* and reproduced in the Educational and Literary Supplement of *The Hindu* of July 4, 1932):—" One of the two dates that the history of religion in Kerala has kindly preserved for us is the date of the destruction of the shrine of Varāhamūrti at Payyannūr* who is the patron deity of the Nambudiris who belong to the Panniyūr Grāmam. There was a religious schism brought into the Vedic camp through the powerful influence of Buddhism and the result was that the reformers broke the sacred idol. This incident is said to have taken place in 565 A.D. if any credence may be attached to the Kali chronogram 'Cittacalanam' (Kali year 3666)."

It is true that during this period the aggressive and proselytizing influence of Buddhism was irresistible everywhere. But a question would naturally arise in every inquisitive mind 'why was this Varāhamūrti alone selected for the onslaught in Kerala while his rival neighbour Dakshināmūrti (Śiva in contemplative mood) at Chowaram was left intact and safe?' The answer does not seem to be very difficult. For, if we will but go through our

* Here evidently two place names are confused: Payyannūr in North Malabar and Panniyūr in South Malabar. The latter is the home of the Nambudiris as well as the abode of 'Varāhamūrti',

Purāṇic literature we shall find that, of all the incarnations or *avatars* of Viṣṇu, ten or more in number, Varāha, the Boar, was the greatest and acknowledged patron of the Vedic sacrificial rites. Hence, he is known as "Yagna Varāha". This proposition can be well established beyond any doubt by means of quotations from the Purāṇic texts which are familiar to the readers of the *Q.J.M.S.* Yet, a reference will be apt and interesting here to the legendary explanation of the name 'Barhishmati,' of the capital city of Brahmāvarta which was the stronghold of Vedic ritualism. For, here, in this sacred city, the Varāha's thick hairs had fallen, on his shaking his body and limbs, and grew as sacred evergreen grass (*Kuśa* and *Kāsa*) with which the Ṛṣis defeated and slew the anti-Vedic demons (Rākṣasas) and performed their sacrificial rites to please Viṣṇu, the patron god of such rites. Hence, the city was called 'Barhishmati' which means a grassy green city [*Bhāgavata Purāna*, III. 22. 29-31]. The Buddhist reformers were opposed to the Vedic ritualism which authorized or ordained the inhuman slaughter of innocent animals and advocated and practised the contemplative or yogic method of spiritual self-realization for final emancipation of the soul. Dakshināmūrti or Śiva in yogic pose, on the other hand, is somewhat akin or similar to Lord Buddha in this and many other respects as both are depicted as seated in penance under the sacred fig trees (*Vaṭa* and *Asvattha*) as the great friends or patrons of Kubera (the lord of wealth), as the conquerors of Māra, the tempter, and also as the Omniscient Ones (*Sarvajna*). In his third University Lecture in Madras on Java (Greater India Series) Dr. Kalidas Nag, explaining the pictures exhibited to illustrate the relationship between Śiva and Buddha, is reported† to have stated as follows :—"The image belonged to the Javanese sculptures of the mediæval period when Śiva and Buddha were identified as one god. One of the Javanese inscriptions was to the effect that unless and until the Javanese believed that Śiva and Buddha were identical gods they had no salvation. In spite of the forms which were varied, the Javanese had strong faith in the fundamental basis of unity." It would be clear now why 'Varāhamūrti' was burned and destroyed and Dakshināmūrti spared.

---

† *The Hindu*, Friday, October 14, 1927; *vide* also my paper on "Daksha *versus* Śiva" or "Karma *versus* Jnāna" in *Q.J.M.S.*, July 1927.

The ancient history of Kerala, as of any other country, is more or less traditional, the men and events therein mentioned being shrouded in a thick mist (which is slowly but gradually dissolving in research light) and consequently not yet discernible well. Let us leave it behind and come to a later age where our ground is surer and things are more clear, natural and real. In the mediæval period of the history of Kerala, the Moors settled in the Malabar Coast and their converts and adherents, locally known as the Moplas, played a very important part especially in that part of the country which is now known as the British Malabar. It is a well-known fact that these fanatic Mohammedans formed a very appreciable portion of the Zamorin's army or militia and rendered him effective military service during his glorious régime now long past; and to them the pig or pork must have been an extreme abomination as it is to the followers of Islam now. We can now imagine more or less vividly what must have been the consternation, then, of those Brahmin or Nambudiri villagers of Panniyūr where Viṣṇu in the form of Varāha, a boar or pig, was actually worshipped in a sacred shrine which was owned and maintained by them. They were, in all probability, seized or possessed with a panic, and in that state of mind driven to the sacrilegious step of burning and destroying the sacred idol of their patron deity for safeguarding their vital and temporal interests; and thereby actually incurred the displeasure of the Hindu ruler, the Zamorin himself. The consequences were disastrous. This seems to be a more probable and historical explanation of this epoch-making event in the history of Kerala.

K. RAMAVARMA RAJA, B.A.

REVIEWS

Outlines of Indian Philosophy

By M. Hiriyanna, M.A.

Professor of Sanskrit (Retd.), Mysore University

(George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London)

WE congratulate Prof. Hiriyanna on the excellent text-book which he has prepared and published on the Outlines of Indian Philosophy. By study, training and experience, he is very competent to attempt a faithful and comprehensive account of this subject, including in its wide scope both interpretation and criticism. We have in the book before us a masterly analysis of the distinctive features of Indian thought, followed by a detailed consideration of the Vedic period, the early post-Vedic period and the age of the systems, and it will be found useful by all students of philosophical thought in the East as well as the West.

Where criticism of the book is likely to be directed, the author furnishes an explanation in the preface which, while it may not be convincing to all, will nevertheless be found to be satisfactory. He regards the Mādhyamika school of Buddhism as being pure nihilism, relying for the negative character of its teaching on the entire body of Hindu and Jaina works. The absence, in this work, of any account of the Dvaita school of Vedāntic philosophy is also explained. The Vedānta is either absolutistic or theistic, each of these exhibiting many forms. It being impossible to give a satisfactory and complete treatment of its many-sided teaching within the compass of a text-book, the Advaita of Śaṁkara and the Viśiṣṭādvaita of Rāmānuja have been chosen by him to illustrate Vedāntic absolutism and Vedāntic theism, respectively.

Religion is essentially a reaching forward to an ideal, without resting on mere belief or outward observances: it serves to further right living. For the ancient Indian, the discovery of truth was not enough but had to be realized in his own experience. Hence the attempt to attain mokṣa or liberation, the real goal of philosophy. The conception of mokṣa thus transcends all logic

and marks the culmination of philosophic culture. Philosophy in India therefore did not take its rise in wonder or curiosity but originated under the pressure of a practical need arising from the presence of moral and physical evil in life. Mokṣa in all Indian systems represents a state in which evil is, in one sense or other, taken to have been overcome. Philosophic endeavour was directed to find a remedy for the ills of the flesh and the consideration of metaphysical questions came as a matter of course to get us, if possible, to the other shore across the troubled ocean of saṁsāra.

There is no ground for considering that the goal of philosophy rests on mere speculation only because the idea of mokṣa is eschatological. For, owing to the constant presence in the Indian mind of a positivistic standard, the mokṣa ideal, even in those schools in which it was not so from the outset, speedily came to be conceived as realizable in life. Man's aim was no longer represented as the attainment of perfection in a hypothetical hereafter, but as a continual progress towards it within the limits of the present life. Even the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and the Viśiṣṭā-dvaita doctrines which do not formally accept this jīvan-mukti ideal clearly recognize the possibility of man reaching here a state of enlightenment which completely transforms his outlook upon the world and fills with an altogether new significance the life he thereafter leads in it. Such a life is to be found also in the Upaniṣads [*Katha Up.*, II. iii. 14]. In laying a suitable course of practical discipline for the attainment of such a life, philosophy becomes a way of life not merely a way of thought and systems of thought including heretical ones while they may differ in the substance of their theories are all at one in teaching renunciation. The ascetic ideal, however, is only to be progressively realized. The social factor is disregarded by the heterodox only as a means of self-culture and their attitude towards it is neither one of revulsion nor one of neglect. When all is said, asceticism is favoured by all schools and in every tradition.

While some admit the ultimacy of the individual self, others deny it in one sense or other. Buddhism altogether repudiates the individual self as a permanent entity, while Absolutism takes it as eventually merging in the true or universal self so that its individuality is only provisional. Theism on the other hand like that of Rāmānuja and pluralistic systems like Jainism or the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika recognize the individual self to be ultimate,

but point out the way to deliverance as lying only through the annihilation of ahaṁkāra.

The individual's obligations are not confined to human society, but extend virtually to the entire sentient creation, and this notion accords well with the spirit of Indian ethics whose watchword is devotion to duties rather than assertion of rights.

The pursuit of mokṣa as the final ideal and the ascetic spirit of discipline recommended for its attainment are two elements common to all Indian thought. Philosophy is neither mere intellectualism nor moralism but includes and transcends both. These elements are the sole means of achieving the end and are the two wings that help the soul in its spiritual flight. Jñāna and Vairāgya thus attained will give an attitude of peace which is not mere passivity. The value of philosophic training lies as little in inducing a person to do what otherwise he would not have done, as in instructing him in what otherwise he would not have known; it consists essentially in making him what he was not before.

The Vedāntic idea of the highest good also implies the recognition of a cosmic purpose, whether that purpose be conceived as ordained by God or as inherent in the nature of reality itself, towards whose fulfilment everything consciously or unconsciously moves.

Space forbids a survey of the whole field covered by the author in the work under review, and a discussion of any one of the questions which he propounds or expounds would take a volume. We do not know for instance whether gods admittedly conceived in a human mould were glorified human beings, 'super-men' of the old hoary past or whether the Vedic religion was, as commonly described, 'arrested anthropomorphism'. But we must allow with Rudolf Roth that there is a positive moral value to be attached to the fundamental conceptions of the Veda touching more particularly the relation of man to God and the future state of departed souls.

Referring to the mahāvākya 'That thou art' (तत्वमसि), Prof. Hiriyanna says that the individual as well as the world is the manifestation of the same reality and both are, therefore, at bottom one. There is no break between nature and man or between either of them and God.

Such a synthesis, besides showing that Reality is one, carries with it an important implication. The conception of Brahman, being objective, can at best stand only for a hypothetical something, carrying no certainty necessarily with it; and it may also be taken to be non-spiritual in its nature. But the conception of ātman is not so and, as commonly understood, it is finite and cannot represent the whole of Reality. Even as the cosmic self, it is set over against the physical world and limited by it. But when the two conceptions of Brahman and ātman are combined, by a process of dialectic a third is reached which is without flaws of either taken by itself. It is spiritual like the ātman but unlike it because it is infinite: it is also indubitable being conceived as fundamentally one with our own immediate self. Once recognized as one with our own self, it ceases to be an assumption or a dogma and it becomes transformed into a positive certainty as we are under an intuitive obligation to admit the reality of our own existence. This is the Upaniṣadic Absolute, neither Brahman nor ātman in one sense but both in another.

Elsewhere he refers to puruṣa and prakṛti as being sharply distinguished. The one is the subject in experience, the other the object and it is a knowledge of the distinction between them which is commonly hidden from man that is believed in this new doctrine (Brahma-pariṇāma-vāda) to qualify for release from saṁsāra. Here the conception of the Absolute is passive and creative activity is transferred almost entirely to prakṛti.

Prof. Hiriyanna's treatment of all topics is clear and full and we have no doubt it is an excellent addition to philosophical literature bearing on Indian thought.

S. S.

Heaven and Hell

BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

(*Swedenborg Society, Inc., London*)

A CURIOUS mixture of ideas is found in this work of Swedenborg. As there is causal correspondence between natural and spiritual realms, the things of the world—mountains, plains, rivers and animals—are said to have their counterparts in heaven. But angels have no idea of space, nearness and distance being

determined by their spiritual affinity and their progressions being merely changes in mental state. His heaven resembles the New Jerusalem of the Christians, the Mahomedan Paradise of Miskat-al-Masabih, Sukhāvati of the Buddhists and the Siḍdha Śila of the Jains. Light is associated with goodness and darkness with evil. A sense of security is felt in the midst of light and a dread of unknown terrors amidst darkness. The Hindu heaven is Jyotirmaya and their gods are devas. The Buddhist Sukhāvati is no less luminous, being the realm of Amitābha.

Swedenborg distinguishes between different regions of the heaven. Hindus make a distinction between Devayāna presided over by the sun to which the dead go by wings of fire and Pitṛyāna presided over by the moon to which they go by wings of smoke. While those who go to Devayāna are not reborn, those that go to Pitṛyāna are born again as soon as their merit is exhausted.

The psychology of the requiem service, prayer for the dead, piṇḍas for the departed, and food offering to the deceased, whether at time of burial or after, is exactly the same.

The heaven of the Hindu is temporary, while that of the Iranian, the Christian and the Mahomedan is eternal. Also the Hindu believes that souls have to strive to attain mukti, whereas the other faiths rely on the principle of election, *i.e.*, God's choice of souls to be saved. The theory of mediation is unknown to the Hindu, while the Christian and the Moslem believe that at the time of divine judgment the Prophet or Messiah will intercede for them.

The fact that despite the difficulty of imagining heaven in coherent and intelligent terms the desire for and faith in it persist can only be set down to the intense desire of man to be in a better land where the evils and sufferings of this world do not exist and the struggles of life are at an end.

As life is identified with light, death is identified with darkness. Extreme heat is associated with hell by all except Tibetans who believe in cold hells. For different sins, different hells are reserved but opportunities are provided in a realm beyond the grave to improve the character of the dead and to fit them for entrance into the land of the blessed. This is the doctrine of the purgatario in Christian thought. It is imagined that a time

would come when the hell would be emptied of its inhabitants when Christ visits it. In Buddhism also the visit of Buddha has a similar effect. A similar belief obtains among the Zoroastrians.

Since a poet cannot be taken as an explorer, these descriptions of heaven and hell by Swedenborg should be considered not as geographical reports but as poetic fiction. We have, in the book under review, pictures such as original artists paint and not photographs that even amateurs might take.

S. S.

Chitraprabha

A Commentary on Haridiksita's Laghu Sabdaratna

By Bhagavata Hari Sastri

(*Andhra University Series No. 6. Waltair. Price Rs. 4*)

THIS is a commentary of a portion of Śabdaratna, the commentary of Prauḍhamanoramā which, in its turn, is a commentary of Siddhāntakaumudi, the famous exposition of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Its author is a renowned Vaiyākaraṇi having studied Vyākaraṇa under Kāśinātha Śāstri, the famous grammarian of Benares, for fourteen years and having devoted most of his life in teaching Vyākaraṇa and writing well-known works like *Vākyārthacandrikā*.

It is ably edited with copious notes by Mahāmahopādhyāya Tātā Subbarāya Śāstri, Lecturer in Vyākaraṇa, Maharaja's Sanskrit College, Vizianagaram. The editor is an adherent of the Nāgeśa school of grammarians, while the author belongs to the post-Nāgeśa school. The editor has, in his notes, tried to defend Nāgeśa against the attacks of later grammarians including the author.

The work is the first of the series to be published under the auspices of the princely Bobbili Endowment for encouragement of Telugu and Sanskrit learning. May this attempt of the Āndhra University for the promotion of Sanskrit learning be crowned with success is the wish of all Sanskrit scholars.

N. I.

The Philosophy of Islam

BY KHAN SAHIB KHAZA KHAN, B.A.

(*Second Edition, Madras. Price Re. 1-4-0*)

ISLAM is submission of man's will to God's will. But his responsibility does not cease till he attains the stage when all his actions proceed from God-consciousness. The book deals, *inter alia*, with the nature of God and the theory of creation; the nature of soul and its psychology; the practical side of the realization of God; and God as the source of all actions. The learned author has given an accurate account of the truths of Islam in their philosophical and practical aspects.

N. I.

Tarka Tandava of Sri Vyasatirtha

WITH NYAYADIPA, THE COMMENTARY OF SRI RAGHAVENDRATIRTHA

(*Oriental Library Publications, Sanskrit Series No. 74. Mysore. Vol. I. Price Rs. 3*)

THIS is the first volume of Tarkatāṇḍava, the prince of the three Vādagranthas of Srī Vyāsatīrtha. The book deals with six subjects in six chapters, *viz.*, Frāmāṇya Vāda, Vedāpauruṣeyatva Vāda, Ìśvara Vāda, Varṇa Vāda, Samavāya Vāda and Nirvikalpaka Vāda. In these chapters the learned author establishes, respectively, the following prāmāṇyas of the Vedāntins, namely, that prāmāṇya is self-evident; that Vedas are not made but eternal; that the omniscience of God is established by the Vedas themselves; that varṇas are eternal and omnipresent elements; that Jneya is due to union of varṇa; and that there is no nirvikalpa jñāna. The counter-propositions of the Naiyāyikas have been ably refuted.

Of the two extant commentaries on this work, *viz.*, Yuktiratnākara and Nyāyadīpa, the editors have happily selected the latter of Śrī Rāghavendratīrtha whose esoteric commentary on Ṛg Veda—Mantramanjari—stands unparalleled in Vedic interpretations. Besides, he is a Sanyāsin who attained samādhi and whose brindāvan at Mantrālaya is the favourite resort of Hindu pilgrims.

N. I.

Plotinus on the Beautiful and on Intelligible Beauty

(*The Shrine of Wisdom, London*)

IN both these, Plotinus has brought out the identity of Truth and Beauty. In his immortal Gita, Śrī Kṛṣṇa has shown that this world is made of sacchidānanda (Being-Knowledge-Bliss) and nāma-rūpa (name and form); that reality (sacchidānanda) shows itself in all appearances as sattva (beauty); that partial knowledge of the Absolute is derived by looking at appearances as they are partially real and that the greater the beauty (sattva) of an appearance, the greater the reality underlying it. Says Śrī Kṛṣṇa under Vibhūti Yoga :—

यद्यद्विभूति मत्सत्त्वं श्रीमदूर्जितमेववा ।
तत्तदेवावगच्छत्वं ममतेजोऽभिसंभवं ॥

Whatever is renowned, real, beautiful, brave; know all that to be born of my splendour.

It is the cultivation of this beauty (sattva) in man as in nature that is said to bring out the godliness or the real in them, both according to Plotinus and Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

The Editors of the *Shrine of Wisdom* are to be congratulated on the excellence of the publications comprising this series.

S. S.

The Indo-Sumero-Semitic-Hittite Problems Part, I

BY R. S. VAIDYANATHA AYYAR

(*Madras University Extension Lecture*, 1932. *Price Annas* 8)

IT is now admitted that the Sumerian, the Egyptian, the Babylonian, the Hittite and the Indus Valley Civilizations did not stand isolated but formed a net-work of cultural streams closely connected with and interdependent upon each other making extensive mutual exchanges not only of commercial products but also of skill, intelligence and thought. Of the problems that arise for investigation out of these contacts, Mr. Vaidyanatha Ayyar has taken up the question of the identities, affinities and the analogies between the Sumerians and the Dravidians on the one hand and the Hittites and the Indo-Aryans on the other. Considering the enormous work that the author will have to

do under the heads of race, language, culture and civilization; the development of the Sanskrit and Dravidian languages in India both in relation to themselves and to the Sumerian and Hittite languages; and, what is more, the extent of influence exercised by the ancient Indian civilization over the other civilizations of Asia and Egypt, it is really Herculean, though noble and praiseworthy. In the book under review, which is the first part of the larger work, ample proof is available of his capacity to cope with the task.

S. S.

Catalogue of the South Indian Hindu Metal Images in the Madras Government Museum

By F. H. Gravely and T. N. Ramachandran

(*Government Press, Madras. Price Rs. 5-8-0*)

THE Bulletin gives a brief bibliography; popular iconographic notes; archæological observations fixing the dates of the Hindu images in the Museum collection, the character and geographical distribution of the images; their classification with short descriptions relating to size, history, style and workmanship; and illustrations. The manner of the work, therefore, leaves nothing to be desired.

There are naturally enough several points on which a reviewer is obliged to differ from the authors. Firstly, instead of approaching the subject of dates of the images from a new and unobjectionable viewpoint, the arbitrary standards adopted by Professor Jouveau-Dubreuil for stone images have been followed. Secondly, it has been presumed that metal-workers adopted all the details found in stone images in their manufacture of metal images. Thirdly, it has been taken for granted that metal images came into being only in the tenth century.

The Bulletin which is excellently got up is interesting and instructive.

S. S.

Journal of the Department of Letters, University of Calcutta

(*Calcutta University Press, Vol. XXII*)

THIS is one of the very few journals that keep up their traditional high standard of learning. The volume contains as many as eight original articles contributed by eminent scholars. It will, therefore, be invidious to pick particular topics or points for notice. The printing and get-up leave nothing to be desired.

N. I.

Jataka Parijata

BY V. SUBRAMANYA SASTRI, B.A.

(*Pp. 1080. Price Rs. 7*)

THE second volume of the revised edition of Jātaka Pārijāta with an English translation and notes by Mr. V. Subramanya Sāstri maintains a high standard of excellence which we associate with his works. The volume begins with the Aṣṭaka Varga and deals with the effects of its twelve bhāvas. Female horoscopy is considered in Chapter XVI, Kālacakra in XVII and Daśas in XVIII. The value of the work is enhanced by the English Index and separate indices to ślokas and Sanskrit words.

The chapter on Aṣṭaka Varga is prefaced with eleven verses taken from Hōra Makaranda. Each planet, it is said, moving from its position at birth produces its own peculiar effect varying with its progress through the twelve houses. Calculating with the janmarāśi occupied by the moon at the time of birth of the native, he is declared to have eight signs as the seeds of the seven planets in the ascendent. Aṣṭaka Varga is the process by which the results under the influence of the disjoint and the conjoint states of the planets with the lagna are calculated.

We refer the reader to the details of the workings of this tortuous problem in a very clear and understandable manner to the work under review. The table which he has given exemplifies it in a remarkable degree.

S. S.

The Hindu Pharmacopœia

BY A. R. S. SUNDARAM BHISHAK

(*Yogasrama, Royapettah, Madras. Price Re. 1-4-0*)

THIS work which has been compiled from classic text-books on Āyurveda will be found most useful even by esteemed Kavirājas and Vaidyas in active practice. It is interesting to observe that the sources of various prescriptions have been mentioned. The Introduction deals with the details regarding weights, doses, forms and preparations in use. We commend the book to physicians versed in the allopathic system in order that by mutual adaptation the healing art might progress and maintain the health of the people unimpaired in an increasing degree.

S. S.

Bhasana Ekanka Natakagalu
(One-Act Plays of Bhasa)

BY L. GUNDAPPA, M.A.

(*Published by Karnataka Sangha, Central College, Bangalore*)

BHASA has been latterly coming into great prominence and has attained an accepted position in Sanskrit literature. The esteem in which he was held in old days can be gathered from the reference which Kāḷidāsa makes to him and from the praise bestowed on him by poets like Bāṇa, Daṇḍi and others. It is a matter of great gratification that Gaṇapati Śāstriyar was able to unearth thirteen of his plays and determine their undoubted authorship. We are aware of disputations regarding this claim, but we may take it that the plays referred to in the book under review are generally regarded as having been composed by Bhāsa himself. Of the five plays whose Kannada translations are given, an English rendering of "Dūta Vākya" was published by Mr. H. L. Hariyappa. "Ūrubhanga" is a celebrated tragedy in Sanskrit literature and it is hoped an early attempt will be made to give a dramatised version of it in English in this part of the country. Mr. Gundappa is well qualified for the task which he has set before himself and we congratulate him on the success which has attended his efforts in placing these plays before the Kannada public.

S. S.

Raja Ravi Varma's Place in Indian Painting

ಭಾರತೀಯ ಚಿತ್ರಕಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಾ ರವಿವರ್ಮನ ಸ್ಥಾನ

BY A. N. KRISHNA RAO

(*Published by V.G.T. General Agency, Balepet, Bangalore City*)

WE agree with Mr. N. S. Subba Rao that the great renaissance ushered in by Prof. B. M. Srikantia in his remarkable "English Gītagaḷu" is bearing rich fruit in all departments of activity pertaining to Kannada Literature. Mr. Krishna Rao, the author of this work, has achieved considerable success both as a playwright and a story-teller exhibiting keen insight into social problems of the day. His adventure into the domains of an art critic is much to be welcomed. There are few indeed who are unfamiliar with Ravi Varma's paintings and fewer still who do not express a feeling that there is some artificiality in the vast bulk of his portraits.

Ravi Varma, we do not believe, ever claimed to set up an ideal, but he portrayed life as he saw it and consequently where he tried to paint the heroes and heroines of the past his work was coloured by what he saw around him. It is true that the Śilpa Sāstras lay down exact conditions for painting or working up these creatures of the imagination. But we have also to remember that gods and goddesses were of yore put in a human mould and no wonder then that Ravi Varma perhaps sought for models in the life around him. These are some of the aspects which occur to us as being relevant considerations for a study of Ravi Varma's work. We are fortified in this belief by the appreciation which the author has himself expressed of the great modern Indian painter. He, however, exhibits a distinct bias towards the modern Bengal school of painting which thanks to our limited knowledge of the art we are unable to appreciate fully. It may also be that Raja Ravi Varma has made such a strong impression on our minds that we are blinded to the virtues of northern painting. Be that as it may, Indian art is slowly striving to get back into its own and it is our fervent prayer that it will occupy a permanent place in the gallery of the world to which it is justly entitled. We congratulate Mr. Krishna Rao on the exposition which he has given regarding Ravi Varma's place in Indian painting. The book is profusely illustrated not merely from Rāja Ravi Varma's work

but from other schools in order to bring out the main points in the theme of the author.

S. S.

Sri Sankaracarya and his Kamakoti Peetha

BY N. K. VENKATESAM PANTHALU, M.A., L.T.

(*Ananda Press, Madras*)

THIS is a second edition. The date of Śankara is given as 2593 of Kali, but it differs from the generally accepted date for Śankara. No doubt 509 B.C. roughly agrees with the date given to him by K. G. Naṭeśa Śāstri in the *Jignāsa*, Vol. I, Part III, after a discussion of all the available evidence. He says that 2631 years after the Mahābhārata War, Hāla or Pūrnavarma ascended the Magadha throne and ascribes that date to Śankara. The Śringeri list gives 44 B.C. The Kānchi list preserved in *Puṇyaśloka Manjari* gives 509—477 B.C. A fresh examination of these various lists, with the reasons underlying the hitherto accepted traditions and beliefs by competent hands would be welcome.

We are not referred to the actual Nepālese inscription which accepts this date [509–477 B.C.]. The reference in "Soundarya Lahari" to Drāviḍa Śiśu may well be to Śankara himself and not to Sambandhar, but then it is difficult to get over the other facts discussed by Telang, Bhandarkar and others.

The author gives a translation of the *Puṇyaśloka Manjari*. In this (p. 32) he says that the Maṭha at Śringeri about the close of the 14th century was revived by Vidyāraṇya who was sent for this purpose. We do not know whether this is an inference drawn from *Gururatnamāla* or *Suśama* since *Puṇyaśloka Manjari* itself does not refer to it. Much less can it be said that Vidyāraṇya founded Vijayanagar from *Puṇyaśloka Manjari* itself. It is quite possible, however, that Vidyāraṇya founded the empire of Vijayanagar.

S. S.

EDITORIAL

INDIA under the Nāga dynasty and the Vākataka empire are two most important matters dealt with under the heading Nāga-Vākataka Imperial Period by K. P. Jayaswal in his *History of India* first published in Vol. XIX, Parts I and II of the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* for 1933. Dealing with the later Vākataka period, the author refers to the wealth of the second Vākataka empire which enabled even a minister to excavate and decorate with paintings a Chaitya at Ajanta. The influence of Ayodhya is discussed by him in Part III. It cannot be gainsaid that Ayodhya is rich in traditions which embody our Hindu civilization and it is important to note that Samudragupta fully imbibed that tradition. He expanded the domains of his empire and represented the Hindu imperialistic ideal at its best. The story of his conquests is a narrative of the rule of law conditioned by Dharma.

***

Vasudeva Sharana Agrawala deals with the Pre-Kushana Art of Madhura in Vol. VI, Part II of the *Journal of U. P. Historical Society* and summarises the achievement of the Kushana artists under four heads: (i) The figure of the Buddha was carved in stone for the first time, (ii) Images of various Brahmanical deities were made, (iii) The ancient cult of Yaksha worship was perfected conforming in composition and technique to the Sānchi and Barhut traditions, and (iv) Yet sectarian character was preserved in their work. Dr. Radha Kumud Mukherji discusses in the same volume the problem of early Mauryan chronology and history. He regards that the date of Chandragupta's accession to the sovereignty was 323 B.C. and not 317 B.C. Unfortunately, the writer does not consider the reference to the twelve years' famine and Chandragupta accompanying Bhadrabāhu Śrutakevali to Śravaṇabelagola in the far south. If this southern migration be true, then it may be possible to fix the period of his reign with a little more certainty. The reason which led to the migration would also be a matter for consideration.

***

In his article on the cultural affinities between India and Africa published in the *Man in India*, Vol. XIII, No. I, Jiban

Krishna Gan quoting R. D. Oldham considers that India was once connected with Africa by land. Similarities of the fauna and flora of these regions apart, other reasons are given. The cretaceous rocks of Madagascar and the cretaceous beds of Southern India are supposed to compare very favourably. Palæolithic industries seem to point in the same direction. Proceeding to ethnographic considerations, the boomerang is said to mark a further instance. An examination of the bows and arrows in use in India is regarded as giving useful results. The fire-drill, habitations, string figures, immolation are other items in which fruitful comparisons have been made.

***

A Korean eighth century bronze image of the healing Buddha is the gift of Edward Jackson Holmes in memory of his mother and is reproduced in Vol. XXXI, No. 185, of the *Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts*. It is heavily gilded and represents the supreme lord of medicine in the Buddhist Pantheon who responds to prayers and cures as well as prevents ailments, both temporal and spiritual. This statue is considered an example of the supreme height of sculpture in bronze attained by the Koreans while the very pose of the Buddha here and his benign countenance suggest ease and compassion creating in the mind of the seer a sense of human, yet superhuman kindliness.

***

In the *Journal of the Annamalai University*, Vol. II, No. 1, Mr. M. A. Ramaswami Sastri concludes his interesting article on the Doctrine of Sphota. Not merely artha but also dhvani is treated as vivarta of sphota and, according to Bhartṛhari, the experiences of differences are mere superimpositions (adhyāsas) based on the different cognitions of śabda as manifester and manifested. He also gives the conception of śabda by other systems of philosophy such as the Naiyāyika, Mīmāmsaka and Vaiyākaraṇa.

***

We are told that Keśirāja of the thirteenth century was not a Jain but a Brahman by Srinivasa Rangacharya in the *Karnataka Sahitya Parishat Patrika* for October 1932. This question requires more careful scrutiny than is possible in a short note. It is difficult to say that the premises of the author point to the conclusions which he derives therefrom.

Books received during the Quarter ending 30th June 1933.

Presented by: —

Authors—

Asanas, Pt. I: Yoga Series, Vol. I—by Swami Kuvalayananda.

Sankaracharya and his Kamakoti Peetha—by N. K. Venkatesam Panthalu.

Govinda Deekshita—by N. K. Venkatesam Panthalu.

Government of Mysore—

Village Panchayets Administration Report, 1931-32.

Live-Stock Section Report, 1931-32.

Revenue Administration Report, 1931-32.

Mysore Treasuries Report, 1931-32.

Yogasrama, Madras—

Hindu Pharmacopœia—by A. R. S. Sundaram.

Government of India—

Catalogue of Wall-Paintings from Ancient Shrines in Central Asia and Sistan—by Sir Aurel Stein and Fred. H. Andrews.

Sir Charles Todhunter—

Chapters of the English Black Monks, Vol. II—by W. A. Pantin.

Government of Cochin—

Cochin Archæological Report for 1931-32.

University of Mysore—

The Calendar for 1931-32, Vol. II.

The Calendar for 1932-33, Vol. I.

Government of Travancore—

Travancore Administration Report, 1931-32.

By purchase :—

Indian Antiquary : Index to Vols. I—L.

(1872-1921), Vol. I—by L. M. Anstey.

Do. Vol. II—by L. M. Anstey.

Indian Annual Register, 1932, Vol. II—by Mitra.

Printed at The Bangalore Press, Bangalore City, by T. Subramania Aiyar, Superintendent,